DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 908 RC 006 802

AUTHOR	Riddel, Frank Stephen
TITLE	Related Aspects of the Social and Economic Problems, Cultural Tradition, and Educational System of Rural Appalachia: An Analysis Based on the Concept of Scale.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	345p.; Doctor Dissertation submitted to Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS	Behavioral Science Research; Cultural Pluralism; Curriculum Development; Doctoral Theses; Economic Disadvantagement; *Economic Factors; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Needs; Human Resources; *Rural Areas; *Social Problems
IDENTIFIERS	*Central Appalachia

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to develop a model which could be used to analyze the unique subculture of rural Appalachia and its relationship to both the educational problems and needs of the region. The model was intended to provide those responsible for determining the nature and direction of educational change in Appalachia with data vital to the eventual development of an educational system relevant to the region's rural areas. The model utilized in the study was based on the concept of scale, which is primarily concerned with the range and intensity of human interdependence and the relationship of these factors to the ability of a group or an individual to control their environment. Having utilized scale as a means of analyzing the relationships between the problems of regional development, the traditional subculture, and the educational system of rural Appalachia, the model was then employed as a means of determining the educational objectives which the rural schools must adopt as a set of guidelines if they are to develop a program which will satisfy the need for adequate human resources in the region. It was then possible to conclude the study by developing the broad outlines of an educational program for rural Appalachian schools aimed at achieving the objectives which were derived from the concept of scale. (Author/HBC)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 072908

RELATED ASPECTS OF THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS, CULTURAL TRADITION, AND EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF RURAL APPALACHIA: AN ANALYSIS BASED ON THE CONCEPT OF SCALE

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Frank Stephen Riddel, A.B., M.A.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University
1971

Approved by

Robert E. Jewett

Adviser
Division of Humanities Education

RC 006802

Copyright by
Frank Stephen Riddel
1971

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Frank S. Riddel

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

3

MAR 19 1973
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

RELATED ASPECTS OF THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS, CULTURAL TRADITION, AND EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF RURAL APPALACHIA: AN ANALYSIS BASED ON THE CONCEPT OF SCALE

By

Frank Stephen Riddel, Ph.D.
The Ohio State University, 1971
Professor Robert Jewett, Adviser

The myriad of problems confronting rural Appalachians continue to defy solution despite the efforts of numerous programs designed to stimulate social and economic development within the region. Perhaps, the major obstacle to such development derives from the fact that the cultural tradition of rural Appalachia imposes such severe limitations on many of the people that they are unable to contribute in any significant way to developmental efforts. Thus, it has become increasingly obvious that the social and economic malaise of rural Appalachia cannot be dealt with effectively until some progress is made with respect to the development of the region's human resources. For this reason, the author maintains that education is the key to a successful assault on regional problems. However, the

existing educational system of rural Appalachia is incapable of contributing to regional development unless it undergoes significant modifications in terms of philosophy, objectives, and procedures. Although this is widely recognized by responsible Appalachian educators, a number of perplexing questions remain as to the type of program which should be adopted by the rural schools if they are to increase the quantity and improve the quality of the region's human resources.

This writer contends that an educational program capable of meeting rural Appalachia's needs with respect to human resources will not be forthcoming until the important relationships between the developmental potential, the traditional subculture, and the educational system of the region are recognized and taken into account by educational decision-makers. Therefore, the major purpose of this study was to develop a model which could be used to analyze those relationships and, thus, provide those responsible for determining the nature and direction of educational change in Appalachia with data which are vital to the eventual development of an educational system which is relevant to the region's rural areas.

The model utilized in the study is based on an adaptation of an anthropological concept known as scale. Scale, which is primarily concerned with the range and intensity of human interdependence and the relationship of these factors to the ability of a group or an individual to control their environment, was utilized as a conceptual tool in the following manner:

(1) As a basis for a description of the life style required of rural Appalachians if the region is to overcome its social and economic problems.

(2) As a basis for an analysis of the traditional subculture of rural Appalachia in terms of the limitations it imposes upon the capacity of the region's people to develop the type of life style referred to in (1).

(3) As a basis for an analysis of the educational system in rural Appalachia with respect to its capacity to contribute to the development of the type of life style referred to in (1) by helping students overcome the limitations imposed by their cultural tradition.

Having utilized scale as a means of analyzing the relationships between the problems of regional development, the traditional subculture, and the educational system of rural Appalachia, the model was then employed as a means of determining the educational objectives which the rural schools must adopt as a set of guidelines if they are to develop a program which will satisfy the need for adequate human resources in the region. It was then possible to conclude the study by developing the broad outlines of an educational program for rural Appalachian schools which is aimed at achieving the objectives which were derived from the concept of scale.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to take this opportunity to publicly express his appreciation to those who have assisted him in this study. He is particularly indebted to his major advisor, Dr. Robert Jewett, whose inspiration, constructive criticism, and encouragement have been invaluable. Gratitude is likewise expressed to the other members of the writer's reading committee, Drs. Eugene Gilliom and James Duncan, for the assistance they so willingly gave throughout the preparation of this work.

The writer is also deeply indebted to Dr. Norman Simpkins and Professor Michael Kearney of Marshall University for sharing with him their considerable knowledge of the concept of scale and to another colleague, Professor Carolyn Karr, for her careful reading of the initial draft of the study and her helpful suggestions.

Finally, and most importantly, the writer wishes to express his appreciation to his wife, Maria Carmen Riddel. Her constant encouragement and her assistance with respect to typing and proofreading have done much to hasten the completion of this work.

VITA

October 25, 1940	Born - Sistersville, West Virginia
1962	A.B., Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia
1962-1963	Instructor of Social Studies, Gallia Academy High School, Gallipolis, Ohio
1963-1968	Instructor of Social Studies, Barboursville High School, Barboursville, West Virginia
1965	M.A., Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia
1968-1969	Instructor of Social Studies, Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia
1969-1971	Research Associate, Division of Humanities Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Social Studies Education

Social Studies Education. Professor Robert E. Jewett

Curriculum Theory. Professor Paul R. Klohr

American Social Thought and Reform. Professor Robert H. Bremner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

VITA iii

LIST OF TABLES vi

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

- Background of the Problem
- Statement of the Problem
- Significance and Objectives of the Study
- Scope and Limitations of the Study
- Value Position
- Methodology

II. AN ANALYTICAL MODEL BASED ON THE CONCEPT OF SCALE. 40

- Introduction
- Review of the Literature
- The Concept of Scale
- Procedure and Rationale for the Utilization of Scale in this Study
- Summary

III. EDUCATION IN RURAL APPALACHIA: A RECORD OF FAILURE 80

- The School as a Potential Change Agent
- Evidence of Prolonged Educational Failure and Neglect
- The Perpetuation of Past Failures
- The Ambivalent Attitude of the Rural Appalachian Toward Education
- Lack of Financial Support
- Inadequate Educational Facilities
- Profile of the Rural Appalachian School
- The Need for a Unique and Innovative Solution

IV. THE RURAL APPALACHIAN SUBCULTURE 131

Introduction
The Historical Development of Appalachia
The Importance of Isolation
Rural Appalachian Values and Attitudes
The Rural Appalachian Family
The Rural Appalachian Community and Its Institutions
Relationships with the Outside World
A Cultural Tradition in Trouble

V. RELATED ASPECTS OF THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS, SUBCULTURE, AND EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF RURAL APPALACHIA AS REVEALED BY THE CONCEPT OF SCALE 264

Introduction
Limitations in Scale Imposed by the Traditional Subculture of Rural Appalachia
Disequilibrium of Scale in Rural Appalachian Society
The Relationship of the Rural Appalachian School to the Traditional Subculture
Summary

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS PERTAINING TO THE PROPER DIRECTION OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE IN RURAL APPALACHIA 293

Introduction
An Educational Program Based on the Concept of Scale
Summary

BIBLIOGRAPHY 323

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Percentage of Appalachian Teachers Indicating Various Educational Facilities and Materials Were Either Inadequate of Non-Existent in Their Schools 104

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the past decade the people of the United States have become increasingly aware of the fact that there are two Americas. Those who enjoy the fruits of the nation's economic abundance represent affluent America. Then there is "the other America"--the America characterized by want, hunger, and deprivation.[1] Although there are virtually no parts of the United States in which both Americas are not represented, there are now very few large geographical areas whose names serve as synonyms for the term poverty. Of those regions which continue to be characterized by extremely widespread deprivation, Appalachia is the foremost example of an environment wherein scarcity represents reality and abundance represents only fantasy.

The plight of Appalachia could very easily present a paradox to those not familiar with the region and its history. Unlike many of the depressed areas of the

---

[1] See Michael Harrington, The Other America: Poverty in the United States (Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1963) for a description of "the other America."

industrialized world, Appalachia is not situated on the outer edges of the nation's economic heartland and thus easily ignored. Nor is it a small sparsely populated region devoid of resources. Instead it covers 165,000 square miles of land located between the urbanized and wealthy Eastern seaboard and the heavily industrialized Midwest. Stretching from New York to Alabama is a land rich in coal, natural gas, timber, and sandstone as well as magnificent mountain scenery. However, despite its location and its natural wealth and beauty, the Appalachian region represents the center of hard core poverty in the United States. The economic conditions and social decay which prevail in much of the region stand in stark contrast to the affluence which distinguishes large segments of contemporary American society.[2] To those who believe that poverty belongs to a world which has been left behind, the realities of life in much of Appalachia provide ample evidence that a primitive stage of society continues to exist. The society of abundance may have emerged at long last in America, but Appalachia serves as a constant reminder that the process is not yet complete.

---

[2] Appalachian economic indicators can be found in a number of sources. Two of the most recent publications containing economic data on the region are Appalachian Profile (Charleston, West Virginia: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1970) and Niles M. Hansen, Rural Poverty and the Urban Crisis: A Strategy for Regional Development (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1970), pp. 61-69.

In spite of the fact that poverty is not a novel condition in Appalachia, it was not until the early 1960's that the extent of economic deprivation in the region became widely known. It was largely as a result of Senator John F. Kennedy's campaign in the West Virginia presidential primary in April and May of 1960 that the plight of Appalachia was discovered by the news media and thus the nation. Following Kennedy's acknowledgement of surprise and dismay at the conditions which prevailed in West Virginia and the region it represented, Appalachia suddenly became newsworthy for something besides mine disasters and the Hatfield-McCoy feud.

After John Kennedy was elected to the presidency, journalists, sociologists, and assorted government agents made their way into the region to investigate its social and economic ills. As a result of continued publicity, demands were heard from across the nation that the federal government assume responsibility for relieving the deplorable situation in Appalachia. Thus, poverty had been rediscovered by an opulent society and Appalachia was finally recognized as the largest island of poverty in "the other America."

It is not particularly surprising that the people of the United States suddenly reawakened to the existence of poverty as a major social problem demanding attention, for human deprivation is a chronic adversity which each generation believes it has discovered anew. However, Appalachia's role as the "pin" which pricked the nation's conscience and motivated the renewed interest in the age old problem of want was a novel one for a region which had been repeatedly ignored during previous reawakenings.

As a result of the growing national concern over Appalachia and other pockets of poverty, the federal government initiated a number of programs designed to contribute to the elimination of economic deprivation. Among the most important programs in Appalachia were those established by the Economic Opportunity Act, the Area Development Act, the Appalachian Development Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In addition there were other programs already in operation such as those conducted by agricultural extension agents and those established by state and local governments.

Although the responsibilities and the programs of the various individuals and agencies involved in the task of Appalachian development are often quite different, virtually all of them have expressed the belief that education is the key to the eventual success of the large and multifaceted assault on the social and economic problems of the region. Two scholars who are quite familiar with the region, James Brown and Harry Schwartzweller, are convinced that the school is the only existing institution in

Appalachia which has the capacity to stimulate meaningful change.[3] The relationship between economic development and educational excellence has also been emphasized by the President's Appalachian Regional Commission which was charged with the responsibility of examining the Appalachian dilemma and making recommendations to solve it.[4] However, as important as the commitment to educational improvement on the part of those working to solve the problems of the region might be, it does not provide the answers to the key questions concerning the type of educational program which is needed by the children of Appalachia. Commitment alone will not provide the necessary answers. It must be accompanied by the recognition that there is a close relationship between the region's economic and social problems, its unique subculture, and its educational system. It is the writer's contention that a careful analysis of this relationship will indicate the direction which educational planning in Appalachia should take.

---

[3] Harry K. Schwarzweller and James S. Brown, Social Structure of the Contact Situation: Rural Appalachia and Urban America (Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1969), p. 7.

[4] U.S., President's Appalachian Regional Commission, Appalachia (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 49.

Background of the Problem

Although migration from Appalachia as a whole has begun to slacken during the past five years, certain areas in the region, particularly rural ones, have continued to witness a loss of population.[5] The high incidence of out-migration and the low incidence of in-migration reflect the lack of economic opportunity in much of Appalachia. Unfortunately many of the out-migrants are young people who are among the best educated and the most highly motivated of the populace. They tend to have some economic mobility although in many cases it is quite limited. The people who choose not to migrate are often those who are least able to contribute to the social and economic development of the region.[6]

The close relationship between the economic problems of the region and the decline in population is obvious. However, various aspects of the relationship between those two factors and the inadequate educational system which prevails in much of Appalachia are often ignored. The quality of the schools in the urban centers and the peripheral areas of Appalachia tends to be comparable to that of the schools across the nation.[7] However, in many, if not most, of the rural areas of the region the quality of education is below average. It is in rural Appalachia that the region's major problems exist, and it is here that the school has had such a small impact as a change agent. Given the fact that Appalachia is predominantly rural, the magnitude of the problem facing those who are concerned with educational improvement in the region is considerable.

---

[5] James S. Brown, "Population and Migration Changes in Appalachia," Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs, ed. John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), pp. 32-35.

[6] W. J. Page, Jr. and Earl C. Huyck, "Appalachia: Realities of Deprivation," Poverty as a Public Issue, ed. Ben B. Seligman (New York: The Free Press, 1965), pp. 155-56.

The schools of rural Appalachia have thus far proven to be ineffective agents of change in that they have not only failed to help solve the problems of the region but have contributed to their perpetuation by offering rural youth an educational experience which is irrelevant to the realities of American society as well as the needs of their local community. The educational system has failed both those students who will eventually migrate from the region and those who remain behind. Most of the individuals who leave rural Appalachia in search of employment in the industrial cities in Ohio, Michigan, or elsewhere have not been prepared by their educational experiences to cope effectively with the complex world beyond the mountains. When one considers the fact that the United States has become a very interdependent urban society characterized by large bureaucracies, impersonality and advanced technology, one begins to realize how difficult it is for a rural Appalachian who is the product of an isolated, pre-industrial, and personalistic subculture to understand the larger society into which he migrates. To become an effective and functional member of the larger American society and to derive the benefits it makes available, the individual must adjust himself to the demands of social and economic interdependency. Many rural Appalachians are unable to do this without a long period of adjustment, if at all, for they are products of a cultural environment which has long been isolated from the dynamics of the larger society, and they, therefore, do not share many of its norms, values, or beliefs. This becomes a serious problem not only for the numerous migrants who leave the region but also for the areas which receive them. Some of the out-migrants not only fail to adjust to the alien environment and become serious social problems, but all too often the typical migrant lacks a marketable skill and thus is unable to make a worthwhile contribution to the interdependent economy of which he is now a part. As a result of this inability to adjust and/or the lack of a saleable skill many of the out-migrants are forced to return to their former homes or to remain in the city living under conditions which are often worse than those they left behind.

---

[7] The Appalachian Regional Commission Education Advisory Committee Interim Report (Washington: Appalachian Regional Commission, 1968), p. 6.

Although many migrants do eventually become economically stable in the city it is often a long and difficult process.

Those who do not choose to migrate are served no better by the rural school. The typical rural school serves simply to transmit and reinforce the norms and values of the local community. While this is not particularly unusual in any school system, it presents a very definite barrier to those who are seeking to promote Appalachian development. The problem involved stems from the fact that the traditional subculture of rural Appalachia manifests a variety of values and beliefs which are much stronger deterrents to change than the values and beliefs which tend to characterize the larger American society. Consequently the rural school does nothing to stimulate the innovative and dynamic leadership needed by the region, change is not forthcoming, and social, economic, and intellectual stagnation persist.

If the school is to serve as one of the major change agents in the attempt to promote development in rural Appalachia, it is obvious that the educational system itself must first undergo a considerable amount of change. Despite the widespread recognition of this fact by those charged with the task of dealing with the problems of Appalachia, questions remain concerning the direction educational innovation should take. To date millions of dollars have been expended by the federal, state and local governments in an attempt to improve the quality of education in

Appalachia. For the most part the funds have been spent on rather conventional methods which have traditionally been utilized to bring about improvement in educational systems. Some innovative programs have been instituted in the region, but they have been very limited. Although it is probably too early to determine if the current efforts will succeed, it is the opinion of the writer that educational problems in Appalachia will not respond in a significant way to conventional techniques designed to bring about improvement. The educational problems of the rural areas are closely related to the unique character of the Appalachian and to the unique subculture which produced him and, therefore, they require a new approach which recognizes the importance of regional cultural factors.

This is not to say that educators interested in rural Appalachia have completely ignored cultural factors. No doubt some of them are fully aware of the cultural data which relates to the educational problems of the region. Nevertheless, the large amount of sociological and cultural data on rural Appalachia does not seem to have contributed significantly to many of the recent attempts to bring about meaningful change in the educational system. Perhaps, the major reason for the failure of educators to utilize knowledge from the social sciences in an effective manner is not their disregard for cultural factors but the existence of the very difficult task of ordering the mass of extant data so that it reveals some answers which can be used as a source of guidance in directing educational change. It is the writer's contention that a conceptual tool capable of assisting educators to analyze the educational problems of rural Appalachia in terms of the many cultural variables involved would contribute immeasureably to the search for a relevant educational program for the rural youth of Appalachia.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study, then, is to develop a theoretical model which can be utilized to analyze the unique subculture of rural Appalachia and its relationship to both the educational problems and needs of the region. The model will be applied to available cultural data on the region and conclusions will be drawn concerning the considerations which the writer feels should be instrumental in guiding the direction of educational change in rural Appalachia. Hopefully, the eventual development of an educational program which is based on these considerations will not only contribute to the social and economic development of the region but also to a significant increase in the potential of both the migrant and non-migrant to adjust to the demands of life in a highly interdependent and complex society.

Significance and Objectives of the Study

The task of overcoming the problems of rural Appalachia and its people is indeed an awesome one. However, it is a task which must be accomplished if "the other America" is to disappear. The continued existence of widespread human suffering should serve as a sufficient justification for the efforts being directed toward improving the social and economic situation in Appalachia. However, there are additional aspects of the Appalachian dilemma which, while they may not be as poignant or as moving as the spectre of human suffering, present significant reasons for an action program nevertheless.

While one can agree with the necessity for a welfare program designed to assist those unable to help themselves or those in need of temporary assistance, it is difficult to accept the creation of a state of welfare dependency among large numbers of rural Appalachians primarily because no better social strategy has been visualized. Harry Caudill has observed that parts of Appalachia have witnessed "the growth of 'welfarism' on a scale unequaled elsewhere in North America and scarcely surpassed anywhere in the world."[8] The economic cost of such a program is of course quite high, but the loss to the nation and the region in terms of human resources and productive vigor is even more appalling. The negative effects of generations of welfare dependency in terms of the humbled pride and the disappearance of morale and hope among the once hardy and independent mountaineer is all too apparent to observers of the Appalachian scene.[9]

---

[8] Harry M. Caudill, Night Comes to the Cumberlands: A Biography of a Depressed Area (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1962), p. 273.

In addition to the economic and human costs mentioned thus far, the relationship between rural poverty and the urban crisis must also be considered. Given the numerous problems besetting the urban centers of the nation, it is obvious that they can ill afford the additional burdens imposed upon them by the continued influx of Appalachian migrants who are all too often unable to contribute to the growth and development of their newly chosen homes. Many of the migrants simply transmit the social and economic shortcomings which characterize rural Appalachia to the city. In this sense the dilemma of Appalachia is not only a regional problem, it has become a national problem.

The significance of the problems encountered in rural Appalachia have gradually been recognized by the federal government as well as the governments of the states which comprise the region. So too has the significance of educational development to the well being of the region.

---

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 273-301. Caudill provides a lengthy description of the negative effects of the chronically mismanaged and thoroughly corrupt welfare system in Eastern Kentucky.

Given the fact that educational improvement in Appalachia has been assigned top priority by those responsible for or interested in regional planning, the need for information upon which to base necessary changes is apparent. Therefore, the major objective of this study is to provide information and ideas which should prove to be useful in determining the proper direction of educational change in rural Appalachia. A secondary objective of the study stems from the author's belief that the information it contains will be of assistance to those educators in urban schools who are concerned with the learning difficulties experienced by children who have migrated from rural Appalachia.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

Although Appalachia has long been considered a distinct geographical region, it is possible to find a number of delineations of the area which have been formed over the years by various individuals or groups. The delineation utilized in this study is that developed by the Appalachian Regional Commission and includes the following subregions: Northern Appalachia which includes parts of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Maryland as well as northern West Virginia; Southern Appalachia which includes parts of Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia and the Carolinas; the Appalachian Highlands which extend through the hill country from northern Georgia to the Catskills of

New York; and Central Appalachia which is made up of sixty counties in eastern Kentucky, southern West Virginia, northern Tennessee, and southwestern Virginia.[10]

Because of the size and diversity of Appalachia, the study will be restricted to but one of the subregions. The writer has chosen to focus the study on Central Appalachia for several reasons. Each of the four subregions differs to some extent from the others in terms of its problems and potential, as well as its geographical and demographic make up. Northern Appalachia is urbanized and industrialized but it has suffered tremendously as the result of the technological revolution and environmental destruction. However, the standard of living is somewhat higher here than in other parts of the region. Southern Appalachia is still largely rural, but out-migration has slowed from the area and a diversified economy has begun to develop in and around the towns and cities. Many problems remain but the relative rapidity with which industrialization and urbanization are taking place indicates hope for the future. The Appalachian Highlands is the most sparsely populated of the subregions. Although it has little industrial potential, its scenic beauty provides the area with considerable potential in terms of tourism and recreation. Developmental programs designed to take advantage of the beauty of the area are now being planned and in some cases operationalized.[11]

---

[10] Ralph R. Widner, "The Four Appalachias," Appalachian Review, II (Winter, 1968), 16-19.

Thus, even though the entire Appalachian region continues to lag behind the rest of the nation in most economic categories, the major problems of the three subregions just described are being approached with some degree of hope and success. However, the same cannot be said of Central Appalachia.

As has been noted throughout this chapter, the major concern of this study is rural Appalachia, for it is in these isolated and underdeveloped areas that the major problems of the region exist, it is from the rural areas that most of the out-migration takes place, and it is in these areas that the schools face their greatest challenge and have the greatest potential to contribute in a meaningful way to the development of the region. It should also be noted that in dealing with rurality in Appalachia it is necessary to realize that the traditional conceptions of the term rural are not applicable. The President's Appalachian Regional Commission referred to the uniqueness of rurality in Appalachia by stating:

> Rural in Appalachia does not mean a checkerboard of rich farms; instead, dense but narrow ribbons of bleak habitation wind along the valley roads and up the tributary hollows, threading among wooded hills. It suggests an endless town, but it is not a town, for typically there is no central water supply or disposal, no police

---

[11] Page and Huyck, pp. 83-84.

> station or firehouse, no hospital or hotel, no streets or sidewalks, no shops or places of amusement.[12]

Although certain parts of each of the subregions of Appalachia are rural, it is Central Appalachia which presents a rural problem of the first magnitude. It is this subregion which is universally recognized by those familiar with Appalachia as the region's biggest problem area. Central Appalachia has a population density greater than that of the nation as a whole, yet there are few large communities. Most of the people are scattered up inaccessible creeks and hollows and along the ridges of innumerable hills. The land is extremely steep and heavily forested. Such terrain has made it difficult to develop a transportation system worthy of the name. Out-migration has been extremely heavy in the past and it continues at a faster rate than from other parts of Appalachia. Unemployment rates are the highest in the region and per capita income the lowest. Health and educational services are extremely poor.[13]

Within the boundaries of Central Appalachia it is possible to encounter virtually all of the problems which confront rural areas throughout the Appalachian region.

---

[12] President's Appalachian Regional Commission, Appalachia, pp. 4-8.

[13] Page and Huyck, pp. 84-89 and Widner, Appalachian Review, II, 17.

Thus, it seems reasonable to assert that Central Appalachia provides an opportunity to study the rural problems of the entire region in microcosm.

Throughout the remainder of this study Central Appalachia will be used as a source of data and examples whenever possible. In those instances where data is not available for Central Appalachia alone regional data will be utilized.[14] However, one will generally be safe in inferring from such data that the situation it represents is even worse in Central Appalachia than in the region as a whole. It should also be noted that in most instances what is true of Central Appalachia will be true to a large degree of the more isolated and underdeveloped rural areas throughout the region.

It is also important at this point to emphasize the fact that it is not the intention of the writer to imply that all rural Appalachians are similar in background, thought, or actions. Although it is probably valid to assume that all those who have lived in rural Appalachia for any length of time have been influenced by the traditional subculture to some extent, it would be misleading to portray the population as being culturally and socially homogeneous. The better studies of Appalachia have carefully pointed out that most rural areas in the region have a middle class and a professional class which reflect the modern way of life.[15] It is virtually impossible to determine with any accuracy the percentage of people who follow the traditional ways of the Appalachian subculture or the number who have rejected it. In addition, there are, of course, many rural Appalachians who have to one degree or another been influenced by both modern and traditional ways. Therefore, what is described in this study as being characteristic of the traditional subculture which prevails in rural Appalachia will obviously not apply to every situation, community, or person. The intent of the writer is simply to depict the traditional subculture which continues to exert a tremendous amount of control over the thought and actions of a considerable proportion of the population of rural Appalachia. Regardless of the exact number of people who do or do not fit the description of the Appalachian traditionalist, it is not difficult to observe the barriers to regional development that are raised by the Appalachian subculture. It is this point that is vital to an understanding of both the dilemma of rural Appalachia and the objectives of this study.

---

[14] It should be noted that most delineations of Appalachian subregions differ from the one developed by the Appalachian Regional Commission in that they include eastern Kentucky, southern West Virginia, northern Tennessee, and southwestern Virginia in Southern rather than Central Appalachia. Mention is being made of this difference in order to account for the fact that much of the data utilized in this study are drawn from sources whose titles indicate that they deal with Southern Appalachia and not Central Appalachia.

---

[15] See, for example, Jack E. Weller, Yesterday's People; Life in Contemporary Appalachia (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1965); John B. Stephenson, Shiloh: A Mountain Community (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1968); Thomas R. Ford (ed.), The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962).

Value Position

It would seem appropriate at this point to deal with the very important value dilemmas which are always present whenever proposals are made to intervene in the way of life of a particular group of people. More specifically, do we have the right or the duty to attempt to change the traditional life style of rural Appalachia? If the answer to the foregoing question is affirmative, then a second important question must be raised. What direction should change in the region take? Although the value dilemmas involved in these questions are logically insoluble, a choice must be made by those who are concerned with the future of rural Appalachia and its people. Therefore, what follows is the rationale upon which the writer has based his belief that it is both necessary and ethical for educators and others to promote change in the Appalachian region.

Despite the considerable appeal of cultural relativism in the academic world there are certain problems involved in this line of thought. For example, what cultural judgments should a humane and concerned individual reach with respect to a society which is intolerant and oppressive toward particular groups and individuals within that society? Must one ignore and thus condone racism, religious intolerance, or exploitation in the name of cultural relativism? Must the social and economic plight of thousands of rural Appalachians be accepted simply because we must honor in its entirety a cultural heritage which has had little opportunity to adapt to modernity and is, therefore, largely responsible for the inability of the region's people to cope with their problems? However, the contention that the concept of cultural relativism has certain weaknesses should not be construed to mean that the writer condones cultural imperialism in whatever form. It is the belief of the writer that the people of a particular subculture, such as rural Appalachia, should be encouraged to change their traditional life style only when such change becomes necessary in order to resolve certain cultural dysfunctions[16] which are not only harmful to the people of the subculture but which threaten the continued existence of many of the positive aspects of the cultural tradition which might otherwise be maintained intact.

Although a considerable portion of this work will be critical of those elements of the Appalachian subculture which promote dysfunction within the social system, let it be noted that it is not the writer's desire to imply that the entire cultural tradition of Appalachia is in need of attention. On the contrary there are a number of aspects of the Appalachian subculture which are not only deserving of preservation but which would no doubt prove to be valuable additions to the larger American society. One finds in Appalachia a lack of the aggressive materialism which has become the hallmark of the acquisitive society beyond the mountains. The rural Appalachian is not lost in an impersonal world for his is a society in which one takes the time to develop close personal relationships. Among kinfolk and friends selflessness, devotion, and loyalty are persistent characteristics. The old are not institutionalized during their declining years, and the young are not rootless or alienated. Unlike many of his fellow Americans, the rural Appalachian is not overly concerned with that worrisome concept--time, for his is a much more leisurely life style. However, these and other positive aspects of the Appalachian subculture are not sufficient in and of themselves to enable the people of the region to overcome the problems which face them; indeed they may not even survive if social and economic decline are not controlled.

---

[16] The term dysfunction is used in accordance with the following definition: "Those observed social consequences which hinder or lessen the integration and adaptation of the social system." The definition is taken from William M. Dobriner, Social Structures and Systems: A Sociological Overview (Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1969), p. 131.

The writer's contention that there are many aspects of the traditional Appalachian culture which should be preserved is based primarily on the belief that the positive cultural traits are valuable in that they contribute to the well being of Appalachian society. However, the contention does not derive in any way from the rather questionable position held by those who insist that the maintenance of cultural variety is desirable, and thus, reason enough to oppose any attempt to encourage change among the various subcultures. Although one can sympathize with those who are appalled and frightened by the distinct possibility that future generations in America will be faced with rather complete cultural uniformity; nevertheless, it is interesting to note that those who express such concerns are generally not those who are forced to live the type of isolated existence which is necessary for the maintenance of cultural uniqueness. Godfrey and Monica Wilson have noted the tenuous relationship between the enjoyment and appreciation of cultural variety and the life style of the ordinary citizen:

> It is only in a society such as that of medieval Europe or China, or of the nineteenth-century world society (and to a less degree modern world society), in which some groups are much wider in scale than others, that the large-scale few can enjoy the variety of local styles. The civilized traveler appreciates the differences of dress and dancing, of music and of cooking, between the relatively small-scale groups he visits, but the members of the small-scale groups do not have the opportunity

> to share his enjoyment of variety. They know only their own art. Only the more civilized surveying the less civilized see variety in isolation.[17]

To understand the contemporary plight of rural Appalachia and the tremendous difficulties which are involved in attempts to overcome regional problems, it is first necessary to consider the geographical, cultural, and historical factors which are primarily responsible for the development of the Appalachian dilemma.

Most of rural Appalachia's economic problems stem from the steep terrain, economic exploitation by outside interests, heavy dependence upon a single industry--coal, and technological unemployment brought about by the mechanization of the mines. These are, of course, factors over which the average citizen has little control. However, the inability and/or unwillingness of the people either to devise and implement plans designed to overcome their problems or to cooperate with outsiders who have developed such plans has served to accentuate and perpetuate the economic decline of the region. The failure to cope successfully with the challenges presented by widespread economic depression derives to a large extent from the fact that continued isolation over a long period of time has resulted in the preservation of a social organization and system of values which are largely antithetical to the changes which are necessary for social and economic development. During the period when Appalachia was being settled, and for some time thereafter, the cultural system that was developed was quite functional. However, centuries of isolation, due to the rugged topography, preserved the purity of the cultural tradition to such an extent that there was no large scale cultural diffusion between Appalachia and the rest of the nation. As the years passed the Appalachian subculture retained the characteristics of a folk society and thus became increasingly incompatible with the larger American society. Marion Pearsall's description of the historical development of Appalachia indicates the extent to which isolation determined the fate of the region by wrenching it away from the course of interdependent development traversed by the rest of the nation:

---

[17] Godfrey and Monica Wilson, The Analysis of Social Change (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1945), p. 86.

> Until national developments turned away from them, the mountain population shared the general culture of many other rural and non-plantation regions. Only later did the more isolated parts of the Southern Appalachians begin to acquire their distinctive ways which so largely represented a retention of frontier customs that had once been more widely spread over the country. Within the region the population spread its special way of adjusting to the world through numerous small and separatistic neighborhoods. . . .
>
> The final effect of continued isolation was perpetuation and even strengthening of the commitment to frontier technology, social

> organization and values long after they had disappeared elsewhere. Well enough suited to the wilderness environment originally, frontier methods began to destroy the culture. Bottled up in remote mountain neighborhoods, frontier culture lost its effectiveness, and a process of cultural abrasion began whether there was contact with other cultural systems or not.[18]

The technological revolution in late 19th and early 20th century America bound the nation together in a web of social and economic interdependency. Even though the Appalachian life style tended to escape this web, its economy did not. Having ruined most of the productive land by destructive agricultural and land clearing practices, the rural Appalachian then unwittingly sold for a pittance the mineral and timber rights which were his only hope of economic salvation. First came the agents of the timber companies owned by speculators in the north and east; they were soon followed by representatives of the nation's great coal interests. The rural Appalachian had no understanding of the vast natural wealth which was rightfully his and which held the key to the future development of the region. The speculators realized this full well and did everything possible to take advantage of the mountaineer's naivete. "Their goal was to buy the minerals on a grand scale as cheaply as possible and on terms so favorable to the purchaser as to grant them every desirable exploitive privilege, while simultaneously leaving to the mountaineer an illusion of ownership and the continuing responsibility for practically all the taxes which might be levied against the land."[19] The mountain man's ignorance of economics and the corporations' greed has led to the development of a situation in parts of Appalachia that is not unlike that which often exists in colonies belonging to some imperial power. The result has been nearly a century of continued exploitation of the region's people and resources by absentee corporate interests.

---

[18] Marion Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge: The Natural History of a Southern Appalachian Neighborhood (Birmingham, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1959), pp. 167-68.

Caught in a situation that demanded action, the rural Appalachian found his cultural tradition unable to supply either the necessary motivation or expertise. Cultural characteristics which had once been functional had now become invitations to exploitation and obstacles to the introduction of change which might have halted further economic decline. Thus, the cultural tradition of Appalachia is the product of a different age--an age in which such traits as extreme individualism, fatalism, and the rejection of new ideas and values were, if not necessarily positive traits, at least not particularly harmful. However, these same traits as well as others were destined to become increasingly harmful to the future of the region as the result of the growing interdependency of the nation and the nature of the economic plight which existed in much of Appalachia. Given the relationship between the problems of the region and the cultural tradition of Appalachia, it does not seem overly pessimistic to point out that the continued failure of the rural Appalachian to modify those aspects of his subculture which are primarily responsible for the dysfunctions which characterize life in parts of the region may well lead to the eventual destruction of the best features the culture has to offer.[20]

---

[19] Caudill, p. 72.

In view of the fact that there is abundant evidence of serious dysfunctions in the Appalachian subculture,[21] that economic exploitation continues to exist throughout the region, and that many of the people are more prone to ignore or create problems than to solve them, it does not seem overly ethnocentric to suggest that the plight of rural Appalachia should not be ignored by those who value the welfare of the region and its people.

---

[20] Although the author's position may seem to be rather extreme it should be kept in mind that reference is being made only to those parts of Appalachia where a minimum of adaptation has taken place. See Pearsall, pp. 167-68, and Lewis Donohue and Joanne Parker, Impacts on Educational Change Efforts in Appalachia (Las Cruces, New Mexico: Educational Resources Information Center, Clearinghouse On Rural Education and Small Schools, New Mexico State University, 1970), p. 10 for references to the self-destructive potential of the Appalachian subculture.

[21] See Chapters IV and V of this study for a discussion of dysfunction in the Appalachian subculture.

Another argument commonly utilized by those who object to intervention in such areas as rural Appalachia involves the belief that the people of isolated and underdeveloped regions are relatively carefree and happy because they are not subjected to the fears and pressures of life in an urbanized industrial society. Although such a generalization undoubtedly does apply to a certain number of people in rural Appalachia, it is largely a myth. Even a cursory review of available data on the region should indicate to those who have attempted to romanticize the situation in Appalachia that they are simply ignoring the existence of social and economic problems which produce a level of stress far surpassing that experienced by those urbanites who are not residents of the ghetto. The United States Public Health Service has attested to the fact that the deplorable conditions in Appalachia have resulted in psychological problems being visited on large segments of the population.[22]

Studies conducted in Appalachia during the past decade should help dispel another myth popularized by the romanticizers--that the people of the region are not concerned about the conditions under which they live. There is evidence of a growing dissatisfaction with the social and economic conditions which prevail in much of Appalachia.[23] Such dissatisfaction has been one of the major factors in the development of a desire on the part of many rural Appalachians to join the affluent society and enjoy its benefits. This is not to say, however, that the pressures of poverty and/or rising expectations and desires are sufficient to overcome cultural constraints on the adaptation of the traditional life style necessary to achieve economic development. Those familiar with rural Appalachia realize that such is not the case. However, this growing desire on the part of the poverty stricken to acquire the "better things of life" is a very necessary first step toward eventual changes in the social structure.

---

[22] U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service, Mental Health in Appalachia: Problems and Prospects in the Highlands (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 1.

If there is a desire for a higher level of economic existence among significant numbers of rural Appalachians as the evidence suggests, it does not seem unethical to introduce ideas and information that will, perhaps, stimulate the people of the region to behave in the kinds of ways that are required for social and economic development. Such action is necessary if the objective is either to help the rural Appalachian overcome the serious problems of his community or to facilitate the success and adjustment of those who leave the region and seek a better life in the larger American society.

---

[23] See, for example, Thomas R. Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962); Cyrus M. Johnson, A. Lee Coleman, and William B. Clifford, Mountain Families in Poverty, Final Report (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1967); John Photiadis, Changes in the Rural Southern Appalachian Community (Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1968).

It is also becoming increasingly evident that change in rural Appalachia is inevitable. The key question involved is not whether change will or will not take place but when will it take place and what effect will it have on the region and its people. Although there are still many obstacles to change in rural Appalachia, Weller has described a number of forces for change which are impinging on the region that can no longer be ignored or effectively resisted even by those who might wish to preserve cultural isolation. Highways and television are slowly bringing the stifling geographic isolation to an end. Numerous migrants forced to leave the economically depressed rural areas return often to relate new ideas and information about the larger society. The birth rate has declined and thus the conservative kin-based family, once the only important reference group in the mountain culture, is slowly disintegrating. The reference group structure is also being altered by the fact that many mountain women have replaced their husbands in a job market that makes use of their cheap labor. A variety of federal and state programs plus growing number of tourists have also contributed to the breakdown of traditional patterns of life and thought.[24]

If change is taking place, even at a slow pace, why intervene? Let time provide the solution to the need for change in rural Appalachia. Two reasons dictate a rejection of this position. First, even though change is occurring, the rate is extremely slow. While developmental change has led to observable economic improvements in certain parts of Appalachia, the rate of change is so slow that the gap between the region and the rest of the nation is actually growing wider. This situation is no doubt more true of rural areas than the urban centers and peripheral areas of Appalachia. Human suffering need not be extended over a longer period of time and Appalachia need not fall farther behind if the rate of change can be increased.

Secondly, if change in the general direction of increased economic development seems to be inevitable, should there not be an attempt to guide or channel the dynamics of change in order that Appalachia might avoid many of the painful and costly mistakes experienced by the larger American society during its period of development? Previous economic development in Appalachia has been accompanied by extensive environmental damage and the exploitation of her people and resources. To avoid many of the growing pains of development which often result from trial and error techniques, and to prevent the continuation or expansion of the economic exploitation of the region, existing knowledge and expertise related to the developmental process should be made available to rural Appalachia. In addition, if Appalachian people are to participate in and control the direction of the developmental process as well as reap the benefits it will hopefully produce, they must become cognizant of those aspects of their cultural tradition which are primarily responsible for the conditions which presently thwart both their hopes and their potential to control the destiny of the region. This is unlikely to happen so long as ideas from the larger society do not penetrate rural Appalachia to a greater degree than they have in the past.

---

[24] Weller, pp. 135-38 and Harry K. Schwartzweller, "Social Change and the Individual in Appalachia," Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs, ed. John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), pp. 57-59.

Given the anxiety of many intelligent observers of the contemporary American social scene concerning the negative aspects of a technological society, it is no longer easy or sensible to suggest without some reservations that the ultimate solution to economic deprivation is the development of a technical-industrial complex. The growing concern over technology is closely related to the future of economic development in Appalachia and provides additional support for the contention that intervention in the region is justified. Because rural Appalachia is only now in the early stages of economic development, it is imperative that her people be made privy to available knowledge concerning the potential problems involving industrialization. In all probability many Appalachians would be more easily convinced of the dangers inherent in unbridled technology than most other Americans because they have already witnessed some of its worst features such as air and water pollution, strip mining, and technological unemployment. At the same time they have enjoyed few of its benefits. However, the fruits of technology now beckon to the rural Appalachian, and it would seem appropriate to point out that if his choice is to become a part of the technological society and share in its benefits he must also accept its negative aspects, or, better still, make an effort to avoid their proliferation in Appalachia. This would appear to be a wiser course than simply allowing Appalachians to slowly discover, as has the rest of the nation, that the price of a technological society is high. There is the possibility, of course, that given the rugged topography of Appalachia concern over the negative effects of industrialism in the region might be unfounded. It may be impossible for rural Appalachia to attract large industries.

As has been mentioned, it is not the intention of the writer to imply that the rural Appalachian should entirely disregard his cultural heritage and learn to conform to the values and norms which characterize much of the rest of the nation. Above all there is no desire to make all people uniform. What is being suggested is that the inability of the rural Appalachian to deal with the problems of the region in an effective manner or to adapt easily to a new environment should he happen to migrate derives largely from the fact that certain aspects of his cultural tradition are no longer compatible with modern life. America is not an homogeneous collectivity, it is a pluralistic society which has grown out of a variety of cultural traditions. However, most of the cultural traditions which have contributed to "the American way of life" have undergone a significant amount of change and adaptation over the years in response to the constant dictates of modernization. Those subcultures which have not adapted, such as that of Appalachia, have tended to produce many of the disadvantaged in contemporary American society. The Appalachian dilemma does not require complete conformity to an alien life style or set of values, but it does call for the adaptation of certain aspects of the mountain subculture in order that it will be compatible with the realities of existence in a highly interdependent society.

Neither was it the intention of the writer to suggest that change be forced on people who are unwilling to accept it. Even if the evidence indicating that the people of the region do desire change did not exist, it would not seem extreme to the writer to insist that the option of choosing between the total retention of the traditional culture with its attendant problems and cultural adaptation accompanied by the possibility of economic and social development should be made available to rural Appalachia. Given the isolated existence of the rural population and a social structure which inhibits awareness of alternatives to the present life style, the option of choice is not available to any large degree. Intervention in the region is absolutely necessary if the rural Appalachian is to be free to choose his own destiny rather than having it forced upon him by a lack of alternatives to the only cultural tradition and economic situation he has ever known.

What will the future hold for rural Appalachia should it begin to move more rapidly toward compatibility with modern life? Although no definite answer can be given, the writer feels that the following statement by Harry Schwartzweller is an accurate prediction of the results of Appalachia's adaptation:

> America, after all, is not a homogeneous collectivity but rather a pluralistic society; there is more than one America. The tightening web of interrelationships with the Great Society and the tightening web of interdependency within the region, phenomena which are concomitant with modernization, by no means suggests that Appalachia must be destroyed as a cultural entity. Likewise, the increased complexity and fragmentation of the Appalachian social structure, and the increased specificity of person to person relationships, does not mean necessarily that the individual in Appalachia, as a social being, must reconcile himself to becoming lost in the larger mass. To the contrary, it can mean greater opportunity and

> greater freedom for the individual to express himself as a human being. The future social world of Appalachia will be more tolerant of human diversity, and more willing and able to absorb talents and interests that are different.[25]

Methodology

It is virtually impossible at this stage in the dissertation to provide an adequate explanation of the methodology employed by the writer, for such an explanation necessarily involves a lengthy elaboration of the analytical model which has been utilized throughout the study. Given the fact that Chapter II is devoted entirely to an explication of the concept of scale, upon which the analytical model is based, it would seem best to include a more detailed explanation of the procedural aspects of the study in the following chapter. Despite the fact that a satisfactory description of the writer's methodological approach cannot be included at this point, it is possible to somewhat offset the total lack of clarity with respect to methodology by providing a brief description of the most important ways in which the analytical model of scale was utilized.

Following a comprehensive survey of the literature concerning Appalachia, data were drawn from a representative sampling of relevant studies and organized into chapters describing the educational system and the traditional subculture of rural Appalachia. The scale model was used as a conceptual tool throughout the survey of the literature and the writing of these chapters in the following manner:

---

[25] Schwartzweller, "Social Change and the Individual in Rural Appalachia," p. 65.

(a) As a basis for a description of the life style required of rural Appalachians if the region is to realize its desire to become a part of the larger society or if migrants from rural Appalachia are to be successfully assimilated into the larger American society.

(b) As a basis for an analysis of the traditional subculture of rural Appalachia in terms of the limitations it imposes upon the capacity of the region's people to develop the type of life style referred to in (a).

(c) As a basis for an analysis of the educational system in rural Appalachia with respect to its capacity to contribute to the development of the type of life style referred to in (a) by helping students overcome the limitations imposed by their cultural tradition.

Having utilized scale as a means of analyzing the close relationship between the problems of regional development, the traditional subculture, and the educational system of rural Appalachia, the concept was then employed as a means of determining the educational objectives which the rural schools of the region must adopt as a set of guidelines if they are to realize their potential as a major bridge to the larger society. It was then possible to conclude the study by developing the broad outlines of an educational program for rural Appalachian schools which is aimed at achieving the objectives which were derived from the concept of scale.

CHAPTER II

AN ANALYTICAL MODEL BASED ON THE CONCEPT OF SCALE

Introduction

As has been noted the social and economic problems confronting rural Appalachia are indeed vast, and unfortunately there is a growing body of evidence which indicates that the severity of these problems is being intensified by the impact of even the limited amount of change which is being experienced by the region. Socialization into the traditional life style of rural Appalachia has neither prepared most of the people to cope effectively with the challenges presented by their environment nor to succeed in adapting to life in the larger society should they choose to migrate. Efforts to promote developmental change have not met with a great deal of success, particularly in the rural areas, despite the expenditure of considerable sums of money. While education has consistently been offered as the major panacea by those concerned with regional advancement, the schools of rural Appalachia have yet to demonstrate that they are capable of developing the human resources of the region.

Given such a dismal picture, questions naturally arise as to the possibility of influencing the future of rural Appalachia in a meaningful way. The writer, as stated before, agrees with those who feel that education is the key to the social and economic development of rural Appalachia. However, this should not be taken to mean either that the schools alone are capable of promoting and carrying out a successful developmental strategy for the region, or that the schools of rural Appalachia, as presently organized and operated, could possibly serve as the major avenue to regional development. Nor does the writer's advocacy of education as the basis of regional development derive from the belief that the schools offer a rapid means of solving the problems of rural Appalachia. Instead, the school is seen as the only major existing regional institution possessing considerable potential as a change agent. Realism, however, requires one to recognize that if the school is to play such a role it must first undergo a rather substantial transformation itself, and that if such a transformation should take place and the school does become active in the promotion of regional development that significant results should not be expected for several years.

While the need for modifications in the educational system of rural Appalachia is rather obvious if the school is to play a major role in regional development, the determination of the direction which educational change should take so as to enhance the school's capacity as a change agent continues to present a most difficult problem. In Chapter I of this study the writer contended that the proper direction of educational change could be determined by utilizing a theoretical model based on an adaptation and modification of an anthropological concept known as scale. Therefore, the remainder of this chapter has been devoted to a review of the literature concerning scale, a definition and elaboration of the concept, and an explanation of scale's capacity as a conceptual tool in the analysis of those factors which the writer has maintained are vital to an understanding of the educational needs of rural Appalachia, i.e., the social and economic problems of Appalachia, the unique subculture of the region, the existing educational system and its limitations, and the relationships between these factors.

Review of the Literature

A review of the literature concerning scale is necessarily brief due to the limited number of scholars who have done more than simply touch upon the concept. In fact, scale has never enjoyed any real period of popularity among either sociologists or anthropologists. The concept would probably be far better understood and appreciated among economists where it would be recognized as representing the range of economic interdependence of human groups of various sizes. To an economist an increase in scale would imply an expanded trade area, an improved competitive position, greater specialization, and the accumulation and more effective use of capital. Here and there sociologists have noted that such expansion of interaction in the economic sphere must have some impact on the internal social structure of the expanding society as well as upon its relations abroad. However, with the exception of Godfrey and Monica Wilson, Shevky and Bell, Greer, Simpkins, and Kearney the utilization of the concept of scale has been very limited. While such scholars as Hobhouse,[1] Durkeim,[2] Sorokin,[3] and Wirth[4] have dealt briefly with the concept, or some aspect of it, they did not refer to it as scale, nor is their work particularly important to an understanding of the concept. Therefore, the review of the literature which follows will be confined to the work of those who are primarily responsible for the development of the concept of scale as it is used in this study.

---

[1] L. T. Hobhouse, Social Development: Its Nature and Conditions (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1924).

[2] Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, trans. George Simpson (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1947).

[3] Pitirim A. Sorokin, Social and Cultural Dynamics, Vol. IV (New York: American Book Co., 1941).

[4] Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," American Journal of Sociology, XLIV (July, 1938), 1-24.

Despite the fact that it is possible to trace aspects of the concept of scale back through a number of scholars, it was not until 1945 that a complete description and application of the concept appeared in The Analysis of Social Change by Godfrey and Monica Wilson.[5] The Wilsons, a husband and wife team of British anthropologists, combined, refined, and extended the ideas of a number of economists, sociologists, and anthropologists and developed the concept of scale which they then utilized in analyzing the process of social change in Southern Rhodesia. Their book very effectively subsumes the concept of scale as treated in a diversity of previous works, and, most importantly, it provides a basis for operationally defining differentials in scale, thus making it possible to use the concept as an analytical tool.

In brief, the Wilsons see social change, or advancement toward modernism, in Africa, and elsewhere, as taking place within the broad context of a movement from small-scale (primitive) to large-scale (civilized). Having developed a set of correlates enabling them to determine the scale of a society, the authors analyzed the dynamics of the social change process experienced by Bemba and Nyakyusa tribesmen in Southern Rhodesia. In keeping with the assumptions of scale, and the data revealed by their analysis of the experience of the African tribes, the Wilsons place special emphasis throughout their book on the interdependency of mankind, the nature and intensity of that state of dependency, and the impact it has on prospects for social change. Another point of emphasis is "interpenetration" or the mutual influences at work among the physical, social, and cultural dimensions of the human situation. To the authors the process of social change necessarily involves simultaneous advancement on all three levels of human existence--the physical (technological or economic), social, and cultural (ideological). Moreover, they also stress the fact that there exists an inherent relationship between change or advancement on one level of a society's or individual's existence and subsequent developments on the other levels. Disequilibrium, or unevenness in scale, a situation in which advancement on one level takes place at a different rate than on other levels, will preclude successful social or individual advancement and pathologies on the social and individual levels will result.

---

[5] Godfrey and Monica Wilson, The Analysis of Social Change (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1945).

The importance of the Wilsons' work in regard to scale lies primarily in the following: they have expanded the concept so as to include the social and cultural spheres of human existence rather than just the economic, clarified the major assumptions and postulates of the concept, devised correlates of scale which enable one to apply the concept with more precision, and by the utilization of the concept in Africa to measure social change they have provided a useful model which appears to be applicable in many other situations. Although the importance and the meaning of the Wilsons' book are quite probably unclear at this point, further elaboration does not seem necessary inasmuch as the section of this chapter devoted to a description and explanation of the concept of scale draws heavily from The Analysis of Social Change and should adequately augment this brief review.

Social Area Analysis by Shevky and Bell provides further insight into the possible uses of the concept of scale.[6] The authors credit the Wilsons for providing them with the concept, and even though they do not treat scale as extensively and thoroughly as the Wilsons, or for the same purpose, The Analysis of Social Change and Social Area Analysis are very definitely related on the theoretical level.

Shevky and Bell were primarily interested in developing a typology which would be useful in analyzing aspects of the social organization of American cities. On the basis of the Wilsons' work they postulated that existing patterns of social differentiation and stratification in the contemporary city were largely determined by three factors: changes in the range and intensity of relations, differentiation of function, and the level of complexity of social organization. These three factors are described by the authors as being the most important and revealing aspects of the increasing scale of the American social system. Having identified what they considered to be the major aspects of advancements in the scale of cities within an industrial society, the authors then developed a set of three broad interrelated trends, each corresponding to one of the three postulates of increasing scale. The trends provide descriptive examples of the changing character and increasing scale of American urban society. Next the impact of these trends, which are primarily economic in nature, on the social structure was cited in terms of the significance of occupation as a determinant of social rank, the development of alternative family patterns, new roles for women, migration patterns, changes in the proportion of supporting and dependent population, and the isolation and segregation of particular groups. The authors completed their analytic typology by developing constructs which reflect the important changes in the social structure resulting from an increase in scale and then selecting the census variables which relate to the constructs and which could be utilized as measuring devices. The completed typology was then used to analyze urban census data in an attempt to gain some insight into the social organization, and stratification, of American cities.

---

[6] Eshref Shevky and Wendell Bell, Social Area Analysis (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1955).

Greer, in The Emerging City, also uses the concept of scale as the basis of his study of American urban centers.[7] The author contends that urban theory as developed by political scientists, urban sociologists, and economists is quite fragmented and limited in scope because most existing analyses ignore the very important relationships between the city and the "carrying society." By ignoring these relationships traditional analyses have failed to recognize that the dynamics of the process of urbanization are not unique only to the city; rather they reflect the nature and direction of American society as a whole. Speaking of the requirements of a realistic urban theory, Greer states:

> It must emphasize the study of the urban complex as a structure, but a structure intimately related to the nature of the carrying society. Thus, the image of the city must be contained within an over-all picture of urban society; "urbanization" and "urbanism," in this approach, become adjectives referring to a society, not merely its population concentrations. Furthermore, such a picture must be congruent with long-term change--in the general society, in the nature of the city, and in the relations between the two.[8]

The author's analysis of the urban structure, therefore, centers around the city's ties with the larger society of which it is a part. It is, according to Greer, the larger society which primarily determines the nature of the urban structure and the changes which occur within that structure from time to time. Drawing upon the work of the Wilsons and adding several ideas of his own, the author then develops an urban theory which explains development and change in the structure and life style of the city in terms of an increase in the scale of the entire American society.

---

[7] Scott Greer, The Emerging City: Myth and Reality (New York: The Free Press, 1962).

[8] Ibid., p. 27.

Further contributions to the development of the concept of scale, both on the theoretical and applied levels, have been made by Simpkins. The Wilsons developed and applied the concept in relation to three spheres of human existence--the physical (economic and technological), social, and cultural. However, in a discussion with Monica Wilson, Simpkins suggested that the concept would be improved if it were to include a fourth sphere which had thus far been ignored--the psychological. Mrs. Wilson agreed and told Simpkins that he should feel free to refine and extend her work and that of her late husband in any way that would improve the explanatory and predictive powers of scale. To date Simpkins has developed both the theory and correlates for the psychological sphere although they remain unpublished. In addition he has revised and extended the correlates of scale on the physical, social, and cultural levels so as to provide for a more accurate method of measurement.[9]

In 1963 Simpkins, Kearney, and Moles utilized the concept of scale as the basis for both the analysis of the causation of juvenile delinquency among disadvantaged youth in Kanawha County, West Virginia, and for the design of an action program intended to alleviate the problem of delinquency. A description of their analysis and proposal is contained in Action For Appalachian Youth.[10] Kearney later conducted a study of the Kanawha County program in which he described the utilization of scale as an analytical tool and the manner in which community action programs had been established on the basis of guidelines derived from the concept of scale.[11]

The Concept of Scale

Assumptions of Scale

Before defining and elaborating upon scale it is necessary to point out that the concept rests upon two very important assumptions. It is first assumed that all important phenomena related to human existence can be roughly categorized into four areas. These four categories --the physical, social, cultural, and psychological--are referred to as levels or quadrants of scale.[12] They represent the components of the total social situation of a group or the total life situation of an individual. In order for a society or an individual to successfully control their environment they must come to grips with the physical, social, cultural, and psychological demands made upon them. In other words, man must come to terms with cold and hunger, with other people, with ideas and values, and with himself. According to the concept of scale, all of man's actions are directed toward maintaining or enhancing his control in one or another of the components of his total life situation.

---

[9] Interview with O. Norman Simpkins, Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia, June 30, 1971.

[10] O. Norman Simpkins, Michael Kearney, and Jerry Moles, Action for Appalachian Youth (Charleston, West Virginia: Charleston Youth Community, Inc., 1963).

[11] Michael E. Kearney, "The Developmental History of a Social Action Program, Action for Appalachian Youth, Kanawha County, West Virginia" (unpublished Master's thesis, Marshall University, 1965).

The second major assumption upon which the concept of scale is based is quite closely related to the first. Scale assumes that every human being is totally dependent upon his fellowman in virtually every aspect of the total life situation.[13] This dependency can be observed on each of the four levels of existence--physical, social, cultural, and psychological. For example, on the physical level all human beings exhibit a constant interdependency with others from the cradle to the grave. A child is dependent physically upon his parents until he reaches maturity. Once the stage of maturity is reached this same human being, while free from reliance upon his parents for nurture and protection, then becomes dependent upon a whole range of people who make available to him food, shelter, and clothing. Thus, from birth to death, man is dependent physically upon cultivators, builders, and distributors for his existence. Given the nature of modern society, at least in the Western world, with its heavy reliance upon technology and economic interdependency rather than a subsistence economy, the degree of man's physical dependency on others is, of course, more intense than ever before.[14] Consequently, modern man must participate, both as a contributor and a recipient, in the economic process in order to maintain his physical well being.[15]

---

[12] The Wilsons included only three of the categories, the physical, social, and cultural, in their treatment of the concept of scale. It was Simpkins who added the psychological category. This study will make use of all four levels.

[13] Although the Wilsons are not particularly explicit in stating this assumption, a reading of *The Analysis of Social Change* clearly indicates that such an assumption is made.

Man is also dependent upon other human beings in the social sphere of existence. In order to meet the demands of his social nature, as well as to satisfy his physical needs, individuals find it necessary to form relationships with other people. As the story of Robinson Crusoe reminds us, man in solitary existence is unthinkable even in fiction. Thus, as a member of a family, a neighborhood, a community, or a state, the individual builds for himself a system of interpersonal relationships ranging from the very simple to the highly complex in order to fulfill several needs, among them being the need for social intercourse.[16]

---

[14] Greer's work, The Emerging City, provides an excellent description of the growth of economic interdependency in modern urban society. See also Wirth, pp. 1-24.

[15] The terms physical, technological, and ecological will be used interchangeably in discussing this level of scale throughout the rest of the study.

A third level of man's interdependency can be observed in the cultural or ideological sphere of human existence. While a child may enter the world tabula rasa, his mind is immediately bombarded with a variety of phenomena which begin to shape his personality. The accumulated learning (culture) of his society is gradually transmitted to him as a result of his interaction with those within his family, church, school, and peer group. The concepts, norms, values, and the ability to manipulate symbols acquired through the socialization process help the individual order the phenomena of his environment and serve to guide his behavior. For the ideas they come to possess, most men are indebted to the contributions not only of the living members of their own society but also to the learning of those now dead as well as to members of other societies. It is the transmission of learning from one generation to the next and one society to another that enables man to progress toward higher stages of development. In most modern societies, especially those which are highly literate and privy to sophisticated methods of communication, the level of ideological interdependency both in time and space is quite complex.[17]

---

[16] While there tends to be disagreement among sociologists as to why men live and interact throughout their lives in groups, it cannot be denied that such is the case. For a brief review of differing sociological viewpoints concerning man's propensity to live in groups, see Alvin and Helen Goulder, Modern Sociology: An Introduction to the Study of Human Interaction (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963), pp. 98-105.

Man is also dependent upon other human beings in terms of his psychological development. An individual's definition of himself, or his self-concept, depends to a very large extent on the reaction of others to his ideas and behavior. In other words, man acquires a self-concept only in relation to other members of his social group. The importance of self-concept development can be seen in the fact that the way in which a person perceives himself serves as a prime determiner of his behavior. Therefore, the significance of man's interdependency in reference to the ability of an individual to respond successfully to the demands of his life situation can again be seen, for it is only as a result of interpersonal relationships that the all-important self-concept is generated.[18]

---

[17] For a more complete discussion of culture and its role in the development of the individual, see Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray, "The Shaping of the Individual," An Introduction to Social Science, ed. Arthur Naftalin et al. (Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1953), pp. 65-73 and Jules Karlin, Man's Behavior (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1967), pp. 85-154.

In summary, the concept of scale assumes that all important phenomena related to human existence can be separated into four categories which represent the components of the total social situation of a group or the total life situation of an individual. These components--the physical, social, ideological, and psychological--are termed levels or quadrants of scale. All human behavior is directed toward maintaining or enhancing control on these levels and consequently over the environment. Scale further assumes that man is totally dependent upon his fellow human beings on each of the four levels of existence and that the extent of control exhibited on these levels is directly related to the nature of the interdependent relationships which characterize a particular society or a particular individual.

---

[18] The role of social interaction in the development of the self is effectively treated in P. A. Bartocci, "The Psychological Self, the Ego, and Personality," The Self in Growth, Teaching and Learning, ed. D. E. Hamachek (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), pp. 14-26; Charles H. Cooley, Human Nature and the Social Order (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902); Charles H. Cooley, Social Organization (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909); G. H. Mead, Mind, Self and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).

Scale Defined

Having briefly described the major assumptions of the concept of scale, it is now possible to define what is meant by the scale of a society or an individual. It is, perhaps, advisable to begin by selecting some statements from The Analysis of Social Change which touch upon the most important aspects of the concept:

> The difference between the traditional societies of Central Africa and Modern Central African society is, in one respect, a difference of size. Comparatively few people were in close relations in the old societies, and their characteristics were correlates of their smallness of scale; many people are in close relations in the modern society, and its characteristics are correlates of its largeness of scale. That difference of scale is a fundamental difference between primitive and civilized society has long been recognized, but the concept has lacked precision. We seek to refine it.[19]
>
> . . . .
>
> By the scale of a society we mean the number of people in relation and the intensity of those relations. Modern Central African society is larger in scale than those which preceded it, not only because more people are in conscious relation with one another but also because the relations between Africa and the outside world, and between Africans and long past generations are more intense than they were. In comparing the scale of societies therefore, we compare the relative size of groups with relations of similar intensity.
>
> The members of all societies are equally dependent on one another, but the range of their interdependence differs geographically and historically. . . . The intensity of particular relations varies in different societies, but the total intensity of all relations of society does not. It follows, therefore, that as

---

[19] Godfrey and Monica Wilson, p. 24.

> the range of relations increases, the degree of dependence upon neighbors and contemporaries decreases.[20]
>
> . . . .
>
> Our hypothesis is that the total degree of dependence upon others, i.e., the intensity of relations, is the same in all societies, but that it may be more or less spread out. Intensity in the narrower circles of relation necessarily diminishes as intensity in the wider circles increases.[21]

In surveying the statements above one notes the emphasis placed on the interdependence of human relations and, above all, on the range and intensity of those relationships. It is to these factors that attention must be given if scale is to be understood.

The Wilsons have defined the scale of a society as "the number of people in relation and the intensity of those relations."[22] They have also pointed out that even though similarity can be observed in mankind's mutual state of dependence, differences exist in the range and intensity of each society's and individual's dependence. For example, as a greater number of people within a society increase the number or range of their interdependent relationships, either within or outside of that society and across space and time, the intensity of their dependence upon particular groups or individuals decreases. In other words, if one is dependent upon many people the degree of dependence upon the few is reduced. Among all men, then, there is a constant, total dependence, but there are also two important and closely related variables, the range and the intensity of dependence. An example of the role played by these variables is provided by the Wilsons:

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 25-26.

[21] Ibid., p. 40.

[22] Ibid., p. 25.

> A Bushman, we maintain is as dependent upon his fellows as an Englishman, but the Englishman depends upon many more people than does the Bushman. The Englishman gets his food from the four quarters of the globe, and is directly affected by the ideas of twenty-five centuries. The Bushman depends for food only upon his immediate neighbors, and is affected by ideas of past generations only in so far as they are communicated to him by those elders whose life overlaps with his. The total degree of interdependence is the same, but in the case of the Englishman is more spread out.[23]

Shevky and Bell have likewise noted the effect of changes in the range of intensity of interdependence on American society:

> If we conceive of scale as the scope of social interaction and dependency, the past century has witnessed a vast increase in the scale of American society. Not only has the total national population become more interdependent, with a resulting increase in the scope of interaction--but American society has relations with most of the people of the earth. At the same time, the intensity of dependence on and interaction with the immediate social environment has tended to diminish: "national consciousness," in general, becomes more important, "neighborhood consciousness" less so. Such an increase in scale, however, also has the effect of increasing the

---

[23] Ibid., pp. 25-26.

> heterogenity of the populations included in the same society. The society which is large in scale must, of necessity, encompass many local variations--economic, ethnic, regional, and the like.[24]

Thus, it is not merely the factor of human dependence upon each other but the range and intensity of that dependence on the four levels of existence which account for the differences between a large-scale society or individual and a small-scale society or individual. If, for example, the dependence of a society or an individual lies primarily in a broad range of wider relations (state, nation, world), they are inclined to exhibit autonomy (i.e., freedom from social pressure and a restricted, narrow life style) within the narrower relations (family, neighborhood, town). On the other hand, if the people within a society are closely bound to family, friends, work associates and others in the narrow relations, they will be more autonomous as regards the wider relations. Their concern with and ties to world and national opinion will be extremely tenuous. This autonomy in the wider relations, however, cannot be described as freedom since it has as its correlates extreme dependence and, thus, restrictions in the narrower relations. Autonomy in this sense might just as easily be seen as a form of inhibition or deprivation.

The description of the concept of scale is, perhaps, best simplified by contrasting the typical life style of an individual in a small-scale society with that of a large-scale individual. In a small-scale society the individual is largely dependent upon his own labor and resourcefulness and that of his family and neighbors for the provision of his food, shelter, and other material necessities of life since the production and distribution of goods is primarily subsistence in nature. Aside from his physical dependency on family and friends, the individual relies upon these same people for social relationships and communication. Intellectually and psychologically, the small-scale individual derives the vast majority of his ideas and values as well as his self-concept and sense of emotional security from interpersonal relationships within a very limited circle of immediate contemporaries. Since the range of interdependent relationships in a small-scale society is so limited, the intensity of these relationships, or the degree of dependency within the limited range of "significant others," is very great. Both the society characterized by a small network of intense interdependent relationships and the people who compose that society are termed "small-scale."

---

[24] Shevky and Bell, p. 7.

Standing in contrast to the small-scale society described above is the society which is characterized by urbanism, advanced technological development, a complex social and economic system, impersonality, and a host of conceptual and value sources. The individual who lives in such a society and who is large in scale (for all are not) is constantly involved in a considerable number of conscious or unconscious relationships and is, therefore, less dependent upon any one of them than is his small-scale counterpart. For example, his food, clothing, medicines, and, indeed, the architectural design as well as many of the contents of his dwelling may come from practically any point on earth. His social contacts, stemming from job-related responsibilities, membership in community, national or worldwide organizations, the handling of personal and family business, and leisure activities involve interacting with hundreds if not thousands of people in the course of a year. Many of these interpersonal relationships in a large-scale society are quite impersonal and transitory on the social level just as they are on the physical level. Unlike the small-scale individual, a member of a large-scale society is not completely dependent upon friends and family intellectually and psychologically. His ideas and values are drawn not only from his immediate contemporaries but from the literature, music, and art of Western civilization, both past and present. It is this broad range of relationships in both time and space which lessens the intensity of the large-scale individual's dependence upon any single cultural source. Similarly his self-concept is a product of his perception of the reactions of many people to his thoughts and actions rather than the reactions of only a few friends and kinfolk. Because the range of his physical, social, cultural, and psychological relationships is broad and the intensity of these relationships is not particularly strong in terms of dependency on any single group, such an individual is termed "large-scale."

In addition to the range and intensity of relations, the Wilsons have also isolated several social characteristics which they feel are necessarily correlated with the scale of a society and, thus, provide an observer with a means of measuring scale. These characteristics or correlates are:

1. Complexity (Occupational Specialization)
2. Control of the Physical Environment (Technological Development)
3. Non-Magicality (Scientific Methodology)
4. Cultural Variety
5. Impersonality (Ability to perceive people as acting in roles and to interact with them on that basis)
6. Social Mobility (Autonomy in the narrower relations accompanied by subordination in the wider)[25]

According to the Wilsons, as the presence of these characteristics increases within a society so too does the scale of that society. Changes in the correlates of scale will have a direct effect on the society in question and its members on one or more of the three levels of human existence--the physical, social, and cultural.

---

[25] Godfrey and Monica Wilson, pp. 83-116.

Disequilibrium or Unevenness in Scale

Before concluding the description of scale it is necessary to note the importance of what the Wilsons term disequilibrium or unevenness in scale. Although it is obvious that there are many complex cause and effect relationships between the four levels of human existence, those need not be dealt with extensively in this study. However, there is one very essential relationship between these four levels which cannot be overlooked in dealing with the concept of scale. The relationship referred to stems from the fact that change on any one of the four levels will have a definite effect on the other levels. An increase in scale, or advancement toward greater control over the environment by a society or individual, must be made on all four levels in an even simultaneous movement or disequilibrium in scale will result and attempts at advancement will fail. The Wilsons describe disequilibrium and its causation as follows:

> . . . disequilibrium is an unevenness of scale. . . . the same people seek to be wider in scale in some ways than in others.
>
> In its historical moment disequilibrium is uneven change; it is the failure to adjust novelty with tradition--change in one respect without changes

> in other respects.[26]
>
> . . . .
>
> Frequently an environmental change compels a social change in one institution, but all the other institutions of the society do not immediately change to match, and disequilibrium results. Or a new invention may be made and other institutions not be modified to match the change in technique. Thus, disequilibrium may appear in a society previously in relative equilibrium.[27]
>
> . . . .
>
> The degree of disequilibrium is the degree of unevenness between and within the correlates of scale.[28]

Disequilibrium in the scale of a society basically involves a state of incompatibility between and among levels of human existence or scale. For example, improvements in the technological development of a society, thus increasing the amount of control over the material environment, may proceed faster than corresponding adjustments on the social, ideological, and psychological levels can occur. A continuation of this situation results in the introduction of stress into the social organization and maladjustments soon become obvious. The consumption of newly developed goods may remain very low due to the lack of desire for them, thus leading to an economic slump; concern and awareness may not develop rapidly enough among the electorate or the political institutions to prevent numerous negative side effects resulting from technological development; powerful elites composed of technocrats may emerge; educational institutions may fail to keep pace with the demands made by the emergence of new technological developments or they may not be adequately funded despite the manpower training needs created by a more sophisticated economy; cities may face enormous new problems as they are flooded with migrant workers seeking employment in industrial complexes resulting from technological development; many people may find it difficult to deal with the impersonal bureaucratic structures which automatically accompany technological advancement; and the structure of the family may be considerably altered as a result of economic change. Similar stress will occur within a society if advancement should proceed on any of the levels of scale without corresponding changes on the other levels.

---

[26] *Ibid*., p. 132.

[27] *Ibid*., p. 133.

[28] *Ibid*., p. 134.

Disequilibrium of scale can likewise have a negative effect on an individual. If, for example, a life-long resident of a small-scale community should somehow learn an advanced trade or skill, he would, perhaps, find it impossible, or at least unprofitable, to make use of that skill in his home community. Therefore, if he wished to take advantage of his advancement on the physical or technological level he would probably find it necessary to move into the larger society. However, when this small-scale individual enters the city he will probably experience a number of crises on the social, cultural, and psychological levels. For instance, he may find himself in an impersonal work situation laboring with fellow-employees whose ideas, norms, and values are quite different from his own. Life in the city also presents a maze of bewildering phenomena, confusion, and personal insecurity. The close, mutually dependent relationships of his past do not exist in the city where he must operate autonomously. "Whereas he had an unquestioned, tradition-blessed world view and value system, he must now develop a new one to fit his new situation or else reject the situation and hurry back home. . . ."[29] In many cases the small-scale individual simply cannot make the necessary adjustments in life style rapidly enough to become assimilated in the larger society. If he remains in the city he will probably be miserable, and if he returns home he will have sacrificed his opportunity to achieve success on the physical or technological level of existence. Thus, the disequilibrium resulting from uneven advancement toward the control of his environment has forced the individual to either suffer a considerable amount of frustration or to abandon his increase in scale on the technological level for peace and security on the social, cultural, and psychological levels. A like fate would no doubt await those who ventured into the larger society as a result of an advancement on only one or two of the other levels without a corresponding increase in the remaining aspects of scale.

---

[29] Kearney, "The Developmental History of a Social Action Program," p. 33.

The Correlates of Scale

The concept of scale would, in the writer's opinion, be a valuable conceptual tool in terms of the insights it is capable of providing into a given society even if no methods of measuring scale had been developed. However, several of the scholars who have worked with the concept have attempted to develop measuring devices in order to improve the explanatory and predictive powers of the concept. While it must be admitted that their efforts have to date not provided us with an instrument which is particularly detailed or precise in terms of its application or results, the isolation and identification of a significant number of correlates of scale is important in that it enables one to analyze rather effectively the capacity of a society, a sub-section of a society, or an individual to deal effectively with the challenges of their environment.

As was mentioned previously, the Wilsons identified six social characteristics which they contended could be utilized to assess the scale of a particular society--complexity, control of the physical environment, non-magicality, cultural variety, impersonality, and social mobility. In addition to these correlates of scale, the Wilsons also devised seven determinants which could be used to gauge the intensity of relations within a given group. Since they felt the intensity of relations was extremely significant to an understanding of the scale of a society the following determinants represent an important contribution to the methodology of assessing scale:

1. The amount of economic cooperation within a given society including cooperation with contemporaries or with past generations in terms of the utilization of capital inherited from them.
2. The amount of communication of fact in speech and writing within the society.
3. The amount of emotional expression communicated within the society.
4. The relative value assigned contemporary cooperation and continuity (by continuity the Wilsons mean feelings of identity with the past traditions of their society) within and without the group.
5. The relative degree of unity and continuity dogmatically asserted within and without the society.
6. The degree in which a sense of unity and continuity is expressed within the groups, as compared to outsiders.
7. The degree of social pressure exerted within the group compared with that exerted on and by outsiders.[30]

Shevky and Bell were interested in relating only certain aspects of the concept of scale as defined by the Wilsons to the trend of urban development in modern Western society. Consequently they concentrated heavily on analyzing changes on the physical or technological level and their influence on social organization. Despite the fact that their work with scale does not involve all of the levels of existence, they have identified several factors which are helpful in assessing the scale of a society. Rather than include their entire typology, only those indicators which are of some importance to this study are outlined below. The following, then, represents aspects of increasing scale within an industrial society as identified by Shevky and Bell.

---

[30] Godfrey and Monica Wilson, pp. 26-29.

1. Change in the range and intensity of relations. Indicated by:
    a. Changing distribution of skills--Lessening importance of manual productive operations as contrasted to the growing importance of clerical, supervisory, and management operations.
    b. Changes in the hierarchical arrangement of occupation--Lessening importance (in terms of determining social rank and status) of one's family as contrasted to the growing importance of occupational skill and income.
2. Differentiation of function. Indicated by:
    a. Changing structure of productive activity--Lessening importance of primary production as contrasted to the growing importance of industrialization, trade and service. Lessening importance of decentralized political and economic systems as contrasted to the growing importance of the centralization of the coordinating and control functions of the political and economic systems in the city. The lessening importance of the household as the center of production, distribution, and consumption as contrasted to the growing importance of other economic organizational models.

   b. Changes in the ways of living--The movement of women into urban occupations. The spread of alternative family patterns.

3. Complexity of organization. Indicated by:

   a. Changes in the composition of the population--Increasing movement. Alterations in age and sex distribution. Increasing diversity.

   b. Redistribution in space--Changes in the proportion of supporting and dependent population. Isolation and segregation of groups.[31]

The most extensive and useful work done in reference to the development of a method of measuring scale is that of Simpkins. His approach is based on that of the Wilsons, but he has, as was mentioned, included a fourth level of human existence, the psychological, in his work with the concept of scale. In addition he has refined and clarified the correlates on the physical, social, and cultural levels, as well as extended the Wilsons' original six to sixteen correlates. Simpkins' sixteen correlates are presented below:

A. Physical (Ecological) Level: The amount of control over the environment.

   1. The level of energy development.
   2. The extent of occupational specialization.
   3. The level of technological development.
   4. The extent of the use of scientific methodology.

B. Sociological Level: The amount of autonomy among people.

   1. The level of economic cooperation.

---

[31] Shevky and Bell, p. 4.

2. Social mobility: The number of people with which individuals can freely interact.
3. The degree of impersonality: Involves the ability to perceive people acting in roles and to interact with them on that basis.
4. Social influence: The number of people known and influenced by an individual.

C. Cultural Level: The amount of variety of ideas.

1. The extent of communication of fact.
2. The extent to which members of the society identify with others in both time and space.
3. The extent of intellectual variety.
4. The extent of artistic (emotional) variety.

D. Psychological Level: The amount of autonomy of self.

1. The extent to which the populace possesses technical skills.
2. The level of interpersonal competence among the populace.
3. The level of symbolizing ability among the populace.
4. The level of self-awareness among the populace: This involves a realistic self-concept, secure identity formation, and emotional security.[32]

Having constructed these correlates of scale, Simpkins, assisted by Kearney and Moles, then developed a list of human needs in a large-scale society corresponding to each of the levels of existence. The list of needs is particularly helpful to those concerned with promoting an increase in the scale of a society, a sub-section of a society, or an individual.

---

[32] Interview with O. Norman Simpkins, Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia, July 9, 1971.

A. Physical Needs

1. A level of income which is respectable and which will enable the contemporary material standards of the society to be met.
2. Health.
3. A saleable technical skill enabling one to obtain 1 and 2.
4. Adequate transportation.
5. Accessibility to the larger society.

B. Social Needs

1. An understanding of and skill in interpersonal relations techniques.
2. Acceptable status in the family, neighborhood, groups and the larger society.
3. Democratic attitudes toward other people and other groups.
4. An awareness of social class characteristics in a non-evaluation manner.
5. An understanding and the ability to assume or interact with a variety of possible roles.

C. Cultural Needs

1. A knowledge and awareness of cultural differences within the society.
2. A variety of different points of view.
3. An awareness of different expectations due to differences in cultural orientation.
4. Knowledge about the contemporary world.
5. An awareness of the implications of different value systems.
6. An awareness of the culture concept.

D. Personal (self) Needs

1. An adequate self-concept that is realistic.
2. Empathetic ability.
3. Recognition for activities, achievements, and self-expression.
4. A feeling of personal security.
5. An understanding of one's own nature and actions.
6. Successes in personal problem-solving.[33]

---

[33] O. Norman Simpkins, Michael Kearney, and Jerry Moles, "Felt Needs," a working paper developed by the authors at Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia (mimeographed).

Thus, the work of the Wilsons, Shevky and Bell, and Simpkins provides a significant number of observable indicators which can be utilized in assessing the scale of a society. These indicators, or correlates, can also serve as guidelines for those who are concerned with increasing the scale of a society.

Procedures and Rationale for the Utilization of Scale in this Study

The concept of scale, as mentioned, has been utilized for a variety of purposes. Having become familiar with the concept and its history, it is the belief of the writer that scale has a great deal of potential in terms of the analysis of many additional aspects of man's existence. One such instance where it would appear that scale is quite applicable is in reference to an assessment of the developmental problems which beset rural Appalachia. The concept provides not only a reasonable explanation for the malaise of rural Appalachia--its smallness in scale--but it also clearly indicates what steps must be taken to alleviate the situation by promoting an increase in the scale of the region. On the basis of these assumptions concerning the applicability of scale to the contemporary situation in rural Appalachia, and due to the writer's desire to conduct a study of regional problems, especially educational problems, within some type of a theoretical framework capable of serving as both an analytical tool and as a model indicating the proper nature and direction of future development, the concept of scale has been utilized as the basis for this study. However, the concept has been utilized somewhat differently than in other studies, and a description of the writer's procedure is, therefore, necessary.

Throughout this study the point is made that the social and economic development of rural Appalachia is contingent upon an increase in the scale of its inhabitants and, thus, the scale of the region. Given the problems of the region as described in Chapters III and IV it would appear that the school, despite its present shortcomings, has the most potential of any existing rural Appalachian institution in terms of increasing scale. The contention is also made that many of the most important problems of rural Appalachia, stemming from or persisting because of their smallness in scale, are directly related to the unique sub-culture of the region which is largely responsible for that smallness in scale. The educational system of the region also reflects small-scale regional attitudes and ideas and is, therefore, not at present capable of contributing in a significant way to the needed increase in regional scale. One familiar with both the concept of scale and rural Appalachia has no real difficulty in arriving at these conclusions without a great deal of research.

However, in order to substantiate such conclusions and, perhaps, more importantly to determine what the schools must do to promote an increase in regional scale a rigorous analysis rather than hasty generalizations is required.

The procedures utilized in the study were as noted based on a somewhat unique use of scale wherein it served primarily as a conceptual device rather than an instrument of measurement. If rural Appalachians desire to become a part of the large-scale society as the writer contends in Chapter I, then a considerable amount of change must take place in the traditional life style of the region. While this is obvious, the specific modifications which must occur are not so clear. Therefore, the correlates of scale developed by the Wilsons, Shevky and Bell, and Simpkins, plus the list of needs devised by Simpkins, are valuable in that they provide us with a rough definition of the characteristics of a life style which is compatible with existence in the large-scale American society. Thus, scale indicated to the writer the particular changes in life style which are necessary among rural Appalachians if the region is to fuse with the larger society. Since the school is seen as the best potential means of achieving an increase in regional scale, the correlates also serve to indicate what educational objectives the rural Appalachian schools must adopt if they are to realize their potential.

The concept of scale and its correlates also provide a basis for analyzing the traditional subculture of rural Appalachia and its relationship to the problems of the region. The concept was used at this stage of the study as a means of selecting and analyzing extant cultural data as found in the literature on the region, rather than as a technique for the generation of additional data. Given the size of the area selected for study, it was deemed impossible to use the indices of scale developed either by Shevky and Bell or Simpkins.[34] While the use of the indices would no doubt result in a more accurate measurement of the level of scale in rural Appalachia, such an approach would have seriously limited the scope of the study due to the necessity of utilizing extremely time-consuming survey techniques. Due to the writer's desire to conduct a study which would be relevant to rural Appalachia as a whole rather than a small area, it was decided that a somewhat less precise but more widely applicable analysis was preferable. Therefore, the correlates of scale rather than specific measurable indices were utilized as a basis for this section of the study. Even at this less precise level of analysis it was felt that scale would provide accurate insights into the traditional subculture. By using the correlates of scale on each of the four levels of existence as a conceptual tool, the writer was able to select from the mass of cultural data now available those facts which clearly indicate why the rural Appalachian is small in scale and how these limitations imposed by the culture are largely responsible for many of the region's problems. By isolating and identifying these limitations, further information is provided educators in terms of the priorities which should be established in the schools if cultural barriers to an increase in scale are to be overcome.

---

[34] Measurable indices derived from the correlates of scale have been developed by Shevky and Bell and Simpkins. However, it did not seem necessary to include them in the study as they were not utilized by the writer.

Scale serves a similar function in the sections of the study devoted to education in rural Appalachia. By analyzing the present educational situation in the region in terms of the school's capacity to increase scale, one is able to define those practices which prevent the school from achieving its potential as a bridge to the larger society. Here again scale indicates what modifications need to be made in the operation of the school if regional scale is to be increased.

The writer's decision to use the concept of scale as a basis for the study was also influenced by the fact that those social and economic changes now taking place in rural Appalachia, primarily as a result of the inevitable incursions of the larger society, are causing a host of social and emotional problems. Scale indicates that such disorganization and malfunction probably results from disequilibrium in scale wherein technical advancements have not been matched by simultaneous advancement on the social, cultural, or psychological levels. Therefore, it is possible that the use of the concept of scale as a guideline for the development of human resources in the schools would contribute to the prevention of disequilibrium and facilitate a smoother transition from a small-scale to a large-scale society.

Summary

On the basis of the value position described in Chapter I it should be obvious that the writer views change in rural Appalachia in the direction of a large-scale society as a slow but inevitable process. Whether this be good or bad can be debated, but the process itself cannot be halted, and given the growing desire of the people of the region to participate in the larger society there seems little reason to suggest that it should be halted. Despite the inevitability of the move toward regional development it appears to the author that the process of change could be directed and controlled so it will prove to be a boon rather than a bane to the rural Appalachian. However, if the movement toward assimilation into the larger society is to take place at a more rapid rate, and if the rural Appalachian is to profit from such development, he must promote it and oversee it. To do so requires that the people of the region be given an option in terms of alternative life styles, and it is the contention of the writer that the wide gulf now existing between the desire for a higher standard of living and a life style which poses the major barrier to the realization of that desire could best be bridged by enlarging the scale of the rural Appalachian and, thus, making that option available to him. The schools of rural Appalachia could with a number of modifications in philosophy and practice serve as the instrument whereby regional scale is increased. By using the concept of scale as described above to analyze the traditional subculture of the region and the educational system so as to determine the extent to which both fail to help children obtain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to satisfactory existence in a large-scale society, and by basing educational recommendations on that analysis, the writer feels the first steps toward a relevant educational system for rural Appalachia will have been taken.

CHAPTER III

EDUCATION IN RURAL APPALACHIA: A RECORD OF FAILURE

The School as a Potential Change Agent

While improvement in the social and economic situation in rural Appalachia is obviously dependent upon many factors, it has become increasingly apparent that investment in human resources represents one of the major prerequisites of a successful developmental program for the region. Without a widespread commitment to change among the people and institutions, and without capable regional leadership, there is little hope of either initiating or maintaining significant developmental programs. However, the expansion of human resources in rural Appalachia poses a formidable challenge due to the inevitability of clashes between the values and beliefs of the traditional subculture and the changes in life style necessary for social and economic improvement.

While some observers of the region feel that rising economic desires and expectations are providing some motivation in the direction of change, it is necessary to realize that these feelings have not been accompanied by a recognition of, much less a commitment to, the concomitant changes in life styles which are required if regional development is to be achieved and expectations satisfied.[1] Thus, the problem of human resource development in rural Appalachia is not an easy one to solve, for it necessitates the difficult task of modifying those cultural traits which are not compatible with the realities of existence in a complex interdependent society. Chapter II of this study described this process of social transition which Appalachia must undergo if development is to take place in terms of movement from a small scale society to a large scale society. It was also suggested that the wide gulf between the growing desire for a higher standard of living and a life style which poses the major barrier to the realization of such desires could best be bridged by enlarging the scale of the rural Appalachian. However, questions remain as to how an increase in scale among the population might best be promoted.

The initial, and perhaps most important, problem to be dealt with involves creating the willingness to accept a somewhat different life style. Donohew and Parker, in their study of change efforts in Appalachia, have discussed two conflicting theories concerning the proper approach to the problem of motivating people to change their way of life.

---

[1] Chapter I, pp. 29-30.

The communication thesis, supported by the works of Everett M. Rogers and Daniel Lerner, argues that social change is best promoted by the diffusion of new ideas and information concerning alternative life styles. In this way the desire to behave in new ways is stimulated as is the recognition of the necessity of doing so if desired goals are to be attained. However, the communication thesis is rejected by James E. Grunig and others who insist that the diffusion of new ideas will have no significant effect unless changes in the structure of local institutions are first initiated.[2]

Supporters of both theories can marshall a considerable amount of evidence to document their contentions concerning the initiation of the developmental process. Therefore, it would seem that a rapid and extensive process of development would best be accomplished by simultaneous changes in the thinking of the populace and the institutional structure of the region. However, desirable as coordinated change at both the individual and institutional level might be, such thinking ignores the realities of the situation in Appalachia. The communication thesis assumes that the diffusion of new ideas and information about alternative life styles will lead to change. The success of this method, however, is dependent upon two factors.

---

[2] Donohew and Parker, pp. 1-2.

First, there must be a source or several sources of new ideas and information which can succeed in communicating with the isolated rural areas. Secondly, the ideas and information must influence people to change their behavior or at least desire to do so. There are, of course, a number of sources of new ideas and information in rural Appalachia although they are certainly not so numerous as the sources one would find elsewhere. The mass media, returning migrants, tourists, and a variety of agencies such as the Community Action Program, Vista, the Appalachian Volunteers, the Extension Service, and several poverty programs all serve as purveyors of information and ideas. While it would be ridiculous to deny that these sources of communication with the larger society have had an impact on the thinking of the rural Appalachian, there is reason to believe that their influence has not been as great as one might expect. The influence of the mass media in rural Appalachia has not been carefully assessed, but such evidence as does exist suggests that its potential as a source of ideas and information has not been realized.[3] The federal agencies operating in the region are staffed for the most part by outsiders. They operate upon rather than within the local normative system. Therefore, they are viewed with suspicion and their effectiveness as a source of new ideas is reduced considerably.[4] The influence of returning migrants and tourists is also difficult to assess. Given the innate suspicion of outsiders and the fact that few visitors would venture into most rural communities for any length of time, the impact of tourism is probably not very great. Returning migrants, on the other hand, might very well have a significant impact on those with whom they have extensive contact. However, that number would be rather limited.

---

[3] See, for example, Johnson *et al*., pp. 76-78; Schwartzweller and Brown, pp. 2-3; James W. Gladden, *Community Action in Appalachia*, Unit IV: *Family Life Styles, Social Participation, and Socio-Cultural Change* (Washington: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1968), p. 125; Foster G. Mullenax, "Mass Media Use Patterns and Interests Among West Virginia Rural Non-Farm Families of Low Socio-Economic Status" (Unpublished Master's thesis, West Virginia University, 1968), pp. 43-47.

Considering the situation described above, it would appear that the communication thesis cannot provide a workable solution to the problem of initiating change in rural Appalachia unless an influential source of information and ideas which is capable of extensive contact with the people can be established. While the informational sources now existing may succeed over a long period of time, in conjunction with other factors, in helping to stimulate a limited amount of change in regional thought, the standard of living in rural Appalachia will have continued to lose more and more ground in its struggle to keep the larger American society in sight.

---

[4] Schwartzweller and Brown, p. 4.

A realistic appraisal of the plight of Appalachia also forces one to recognize that there is little hope for developmental leadership on the part of regional institutions. Schwartzweller and Brown have concluded on the basis of their study of the political, economic, and religious institutions of rural Appalachia that they are totally incapable of promoting change in the region.[5] Given the extremely conservative nature of these institutions it is probably unreasonable to expect any significant changes in their structure in the foreseeable future. Therefore, reliance upon the theory that institutional change must preceed change on the individual level would eliminate hope for Appalachian development for some time to come.

Despite the necessity of rejecting a total reliance upon either the communication or the institutional theses, or both, the possibility of altering these methods to fit the situation in rural Appalachia seems to offer the most realistic approach to the problem of motivating regional change. Having surveyed the Appalachian scene and assessed the complexities of the relationships between the social, economic, and cultural problems of the region, it appears to the writer that the educational system offers the most feasible and acceptable means of both motivating a desire for change and providing the skills and abilities necessary to achieve developmental success. The educational system provides a means of communicating new ideas and information to large numbers of people; it is an accepted local institution, and even though the rural school is admittedly conservative it is probably more susceptible to change than any other local institution. Although the schools of the region are badly in need of improvement, it is necessary to recognize that there is far more communication and linkage between the rural Appalachian school and its urban counterparts than is true of the religious, economic, and political institutions of the region. Brown and Schwartzweller are no doubt correct in asserting that the school is the only institution operating within rural Appalachia which is capable of serving as an effective cultural bridge to the larger American society.[6] Despite the indifference or outright opposition to change which prevails in much of Appalachia, the school does not reflect this attitude to such a marked degree as other institutions primarily because the influence of community attitudes is partially negated by the following factors: teachers and administrators have generally been influenced to some degree by the norms of the larger society, textbooks and other instructional materials introduce alien concepts and values, and state regulations concerning school organization and procedures also reflect the standards of the larger society. In addition, as increasing numbers of rural Appalachian parents become convinced of the necessity of an education for their children, community sanction is bestowed upon the school thus resulting in an increase in its holding power and prestige. Even though the rural school suffers from numerous defects and continues to reflect community values and norms, it represents the most influential link between the larger society and rural Appalachia, and as such it has a great deal of potential in terms of the diffusion of new ideas, information, skills, and attitudes aimed at the development of the large scale individual and ultimately a large scale society.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 7.

---

[6] Ibid.

It should be noted that the writer's contention that the educational system offers the most feasible and acceptable means of stimulating development in rural Appalachia is based primarily on the realities of existing circumstances in the region rather than on a naive faith in the present capacity of the school to promote needed change. However, realism also dictates the recognition of several factors related to education in the region which necessitate the addition of certain qualifications to the position of the author. First, it is necessary to recognize that the rural Appalachian school as it is presently organized and operated is incapable of promoting meaningful change in the region. The present effectiveness of the rural school as a change agent derives primarily from factors over which the local community and its educators have little control such as state requirements concerning school organization, attendance, and staff certification; the necessity of using instructional materials which convey beliefs and values which differ from those of the local community; and an economy which literally forces parents to see the value of an education for their children, at least in economic terms. However, few rural schools in Appalachia make a conscious effort to move toward their potential level of effectiveness as a change agent by implementing programs and practices which would supplement the factors mentioned above.

The second qualification of the writer's position follows naturally from the first. Given the inability of the rural school as presently constituted to realize its potential as a change agent, it is obvious that modifications in the educational system are necessary if improvement is to be forthcoming. Changing the structure and direction of a conservative institution such as the rural school would not be easy, but neither does it seem impossible. While it is not within the purview of this study to discuss how such change should be implemented, nevertheless it can be noted that the rural school is part of a larger institutional structure, the state educational system, which is governed to a large extent by persons in the urban areas. Therefore, it does not seem unreasonable to assert that structural and operational changes which are necessary in the rural school could be implemented if state educational officials so desired. The imposition of educational change by decree might not be necessary if local schools simply comply with suggestions made by state education officials. However, in the event that orders rather than suggestions become necessary, it should be remembered that such action is not unprecedented,[7] nor is it entirely unethical given the desire on the part of many Appalachians to achieve a higher standard of living. In all probability much of the opposition to change which might occur would emanate from entrenched school officials rather than the patrons of the school.

No worthwhile suggestions concerning either the role that the rural Appalachian school might play in regional development or the educational changes required if the school is to play such a role will be forthcoming unless they are based on adequate data which is relevant to the Appalachian subculture and to the school which serves the region's children. Therefore, the remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a survey of the educational system in rural Appalachia in order that its present capacity to increase individual and regional scale might be assessed.

---

[7] For example school desegregation and the abolition of religious exercises in the schools are compulsory rather than voluntary.

Following a similar survey of the traditional Appalachian subculture in the succeeding chapter, relationships between the social and economic malaise of the region, the subculture, and the shortcomings of the educational system will be explored. Only then will it be possible to suggest the specific considerations which must serve as the basis for educational change which is directed toward the enlargement of scale and thus regional development.

Evidence of Prolonged Educational Failure and Neglect

Although it is possible to observe some advantages associated with the rural schools of Appalachia, they are far outnumbered by disadvantages. A limited amount of progress has been made in improving the overall educational status of the region, but statistics indicate that such progress is extremely slow and that it has failed to offset to any great degree decades of neglect.[8] The schools of the region, with few exceptions, have simply failed throughout the years to provide the people of Appalachia with the skills and attitudes necessary to the development of a society which is compatible with life in the modern world. While it would be unfair to blame the Appalachian dilemma entirely on the educational system, particularly in view of the barriers to educational excellence which derive from the cultural tradition, the fact remains that the schools have not only failed to assume the responsibility of combatting the problems of Appalachia, but they have all too often become an integral part of those problems by contributing to the perpetuation of cultural traits which are largely responsible for the malaise of the region. Most rural schools not only neglect to develop their potential as a change agent, but they negate their existing potential by continuing to defend policies and practices which are obviously detrimental to change. Despite the numerous problems which the schools of the region must surmount, it is difficult to excuse their reluctance to change given the poor results of their efforts.

---

[8] Bill Peterson, "Discrimination in the Hill Country," Southern Educational Report, IV (March, 1969), 5-9.

The insufficiency of past educational efforts in Appalachia is made all too apparent by a survey of statistics relating to the area. The 1960 census showed that nearly 12 per cent of the people twenty-five years or older in Appalachia have less than a fifth grade education. Only 32 per cent of that age group have completed high school.[9] These figures are disturbing enough, but if one investigates statistics from the most isolated rural areas, such as Central Appalachia, they prove to be even more appalling. A study of 324 families in seven Eastern Kentucky counties indicated that the median grade completed by the head of the household was six.[10] Pearsall's study of a Tennessee mountain community revealed that not a single adult had attended high school, and that only three adults had gone as far as the seventh grade.[11] Gazaway found the median grade completed by the adults of a community in Eastern Kentucky to be two.[12] Naturally the figures for college graduates are also low. The lack of trained leadership in much of rural Appalachia can be partially explained by the fact that only one out of every ten graduates of the region's high schools is now entering college.[13] Only 5 per cent of the population twenty-five years or older are college graduates.[14] It seems safe to assume that few of the college graduates live in the rural areas of the region.

---

[9] President's Appalachian Regional Commission, Appalachia, p. 5.

The high rate of illiteracy in Appalachia is another indication of the failure of past educational efforts. In 1960 the region accounted for almost half of the nation's functionally illiterate people. This figure is tremendous when one realizes that only 10 per cent of the national population lives in Appalachia.[15] According to the Appalachian Regional Commission's Education Advisory Committee more than 25 per cent of the population of two Appalachian states is functionally illiterate.[16] Again it is necessary to keep in mind that the bulk of the illiterate population is probably rural in origin.

---

[10] Johnson et al., p. 9.

[11] Pearsall, p. 146.

[12] Rena Gazaway, The Longest Mile (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969), p. 90.

[13] James Branscome, "The Crisis of Appalachian Youth," Appalachia II (May, 1969), 16.

[14] "Educational Problems," Appalachia I (April, 1968), 22.

The Perpetuation of Past Failures

Evidence of the shortcomings of past educational efforts in the region is abundant; so too is evidence that the failures of the past are being perpetuated. More Appalachian students fall below the national norm on a variety of achievement tests than are above it.[17] Results from the National Merit Scholarship test also indicate the deficiencies in Appalachian education.[18] A study by the University of Kentucky found high school graduates in Harlan County, Kentucky to be three years and five months behind their average counterparts in schools outside the region.[19] A similar study in the schools of Letcher County, Kentucky revealed that 1661, or almost one-fourth, of the students suffered from significant educational deficiencies.[20] Branscome states that standardized tests show that the IQ's of Appalachian school children have been gradually declining from one-fourth to one-half point annually for thirteen years.[21]

---

[15] Barbara Casey, "Early Childhood Education: A Priority Need," Appalachia II (November, 1968), 19.

[16] The Appalachian Regional Commission Education Advisory Committee Interim Report, p. 7.

[17] Appalachia I (April, 1968), 22.

[18] Garth Magnum, "Manpower Implications of the Appalachian Regional Programs," Manpower Development in Appalachia: An Approach to Unemployment, ed. Frederick A. Zeller and Robert W. Miller (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968), pp. 52-53.

Further evidence of the inadequacy of regional educational services is offered by the extremely large number of Appalachian youth who fail the Selective Service general mental tests which are considered to require the equivalent of a seventh grade education for passage. In 1964 the rate of failure for Appalachian youth was 35 per cent as compared to the national average of 27.6 per cent.[22] The failure rate for the region would probably be much higher than indicated because the figures above are based on state results rather than on results drawn from the Appalachian portion of each state. Caudill has further added to the indictment of Appalachian education cited above by pointing out that it is not unusual for high school graduates from the region to fail Selective Service tests because they are functional illiterates.[23]

---

[19] Caudill, p. 372.

[20] Bill Peterson, "Letcher County Is Trying," Southern Education Report IV (October, 1968), 25.

[21] Branscome, Appalachia II (May, 1969), 16.

[22] Mangum, p. 52.

In addition to its many other deficiencies, and, perhaps, largely because of them, the holding power of the Appalachian school is very weak. Although the dropout problem is one of increasing concern throughout the nation, the estimated national average of 36.2 per cent cannot compare with the loss rate in Appalachia. Approximately 65 per cent of the region's students do not finish high school. Branscome estimates that of the rural dropouts less than 40 per cent complete the tenth grade. He also points out that in parts of the region the loss rate has soared to 71 per cent.[24]

The data utilized thus far to document both the past and present failure of the schools of Appalachia have applied for the most part to the region as a whole. Although the focus of this study is on rural Appalachia, it is difficult, if not impossible, in most cases to isolate data on the rural school system from that which pertains to the entire region. However, given the fact that it is generally accepted among observers of the region that conditions in the rural schools are far inferior to those in the urban areas, it seems safe to assert that the data which has been cited in this chapter probably falls short of describing the failure of the rural school, particularly in Central Appalachia.

---

[23] Caudill, p. 337.

[24] Branscome, Appalachia (May, 1969), 16.

The Ambivalent Attitude of the Rural Appalachian Toward Education

If such obvious differences exist between the quality of education in rural Appalachia and that of the rest of the nation, and if educational inadequacy is partially responsible for the plight of the region, why then have the people not demanded improvement? The answer to that question involves gaining an understanding of the rural Appalachian's ambivalent attitude toward education. There are several studies which support the contention that Appalachians generally value education. Ford found this to be true among large numbers of people even in the rural areas.[25] Weller supports this contention,[26] as do studies by Johnson,[27] Schrag,[28] and Pavlick.[29] However, two of these works also emphasize the fact that the recognition of the value of education is often offset by other factors which tend to limit the depth of commitment to education that is necessary to improve the schools of the region. Weller feels the Appalachian's paradoxical attitude toward education can be explained in terms of the conflict between the growing awareness among parents of the need for education and the equally strong fear that it will contribute to the destruction of the closely knit mountain family and reference group.[30] Schrag concludes that the lack of commitment to educational improvement results primarily from the fact that the average mountaineer has no way of knowing what effective education is or how it can be achieved. Before such commitment will develop, the rural Appalachian will have to understand that educational excellence involves more than training for mountain life.[31]

---

[25] Ford, p. 17.

[26] Weller, p. 108.

[27] Johnson *et al.*, p. 18.

[28] Peter Schrag, "The School and Politics," *Appalachian Review* I (Fall, 1966), 9.

[29] Anthony L. Pavlick, *Toward Solving the Low-Income Problem of Small Farmers in the Appalachian Area* (Morgantown, West Virginia: Agricultural Experiment Station, West Virginia University, 1964), p. 45.

While a considerable amount of evidence can be cited to support the view that Appalachians do value education, there are also several studies which indicate that this is not true of all rural people in the region. Stephenson found several people, including parents of school-age children, in a rural community in the Appalachian portion of North Carolina who rejected the value of education.[32] A similar situation involving an even larger proportion of the local population is described in Matthews' study of a community in Appalachian Tennessee.[33] Coles' research in the region also indicates a lack of concern for education among some rural residents.[34]

---

[30] Weller, pp. 108-109.

[31] Schrag, Appalachian Review I (Fall, 1969), 9-10.

[32] Stephenson, pp. 183-185.

Existent data, therefore, presents conflicting evidence concerning the extent to which rural Appalachians value education. While a definite conclusion cannot be reached on the basis of such evidence, a plausible explanation for the evidential conflict is offered by Nelsen. In an attempt to explain the ambivalence which previous studies had revealed in the attitude of Appalachians toward education, Nelsen hypothesized that many rural residents vocalized attitudes which were not consistent with their actions. On the basis of a two year study conducted in West Virginia, Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and North Carolina, he concluded:

> The data support the hypothesis that, while rural dwellers in Appalachia give lip service to the value of education (needed for success), they actually have internalized the value of education to a lesser amount than have the urban or metropolitan residents. Rural dwellers tend to be more anomic than do urban or metropolitan dwellers. This, in turn, is probably related to the tendency

---

[33] Elmora M. Matthews, Neighbor and Kin: Life in a Tennessee Ridge Community (Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press, 1965), pp. 75-78.

[34] Robert Coles, "Mountain Thinking: It's Our Nothing," Appalachian Review I (Summer, 1966), 17.

> to use education as a scapegoat to explain their lack of success. Since education is valued by the larger society and emphasized as necessary for success; and since the local dweller feels left out by the larger society, he can blame lack of success upon his lack of education.[35]

Whether or not one accepts the contention that rural Appalachians value education, the evidence indicates that a commitment to educational excellence does not exist among many rural dwellers in the region. The factors cited by Weller, Schrag, and Nelsen suggest why the ambivalent attitude toward education exists in rural Appalachia and indicate several reasons for the absence of a widespread demand for educational improvement despite the obvious shortcomings of the existing system.

Lack of Financial Support

As one would expect on the basis of the foregoing discussion, community and regional financial support of the school system is not adequate. This not only results from the economic plight of the region, but also from the lack of a strong commitment to educational excellence and the belief that the schools are doing an adequate job. Graff and Anderson point out that a majority of Appalachians are satisfied with what they consider to be a good educational program.[36] Plunkett's Eastern Kentucky study indicates that this attitude is prevalent not only among the average citizens of the area, but more importantly, it is also widely held by the best educated members of the population:

---

[35] Hart M. Nelsen, "The Internalization of Education as a Value in Rural Appalachian Culture: Myth or Reality?" Business and Economic Problems in Appalachia I (August, 1968), 14-15.

> Most of the mountain elites were decidedly uncritical and strongly defensive of local schools and generally the strength of this defensiveness bore an inverse relation to objective evidence concerning the quality of the school personnel and the achievement of pupils.
>
> The most emphatic in their insistence that local schools were doing a good job were the bankers, the Baptist clergy, and the manufacturing entrepreneurs . . . . The mixture of loyalties, frustration, and limited knowledge reflected in these responses illuminate . . . the weakness and ambivalence of support in the mountain areas. . . .[37]

Although part of the responsibility for the lack of financial support afforded the educational system can be attributed to regional attitudes, it is also true that the inadequate tax base which is characteristic of the region, particularly the underdeveloped rural areas, contributes heavily to the problem. The low per capita income of Appalachia seriously limits income and sales tax collections. Property throughout most of the region is assessed at a very low rate and therefore produces little revenue. Thus, the major sources of financial support for education are quite limited.[38] Dykes also found that those parts of Appalachia which were most capable of providing adequate financial support for their schools were quite often contributing a smaller percentage to education than the poorer sections of the region.[39]

---

[36] Orin B. Graff, "The Needs of Education," The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962), p. 189 and Margaret Anderson, "Education in Appalachia: Past Failures and Future Prospects," Journal of Marriage and the Family XXVI (November, 1964), 445.

[37] Mary J. Bowman and H. Dudley Plunkett, Communication and Mountain Development: A Summary Report of Two East Kentucky Studies (Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, 1969), p. 166.

The schools themselves are partially responsible for their own financial plight in that they are both contributors and participants in the vicious cycle of poverty that holds so tenaciously to Appalachia:

> . . . the institutions of the Region, geared to an economy of poverty, not only have failed to solve the problems of poverty, but have often contributed to their perpetuation. The schools, for example, have failed to provide the youth with the knowledge and skills required for high income employment, thus severely restricting the development of an economy which could support better schools.[40]

Even a brief survey of statistics concerning educational expenditures in Appalachia is sufficient to reflect the inability and/or unwillingness of the region to provide the finances necessary for an effective school system. In 1960 the average local government expenditure per pupil in Appalachia was nearly one-third less than the national average. This was true despite the fact that local governments in the region allocated 55 per cent of their budgets to education.[41] Although recent figures are not available on the annual expenditure per pupil in average daily membership for the Appalachian region, it is possible to estimate the approximate amount by utilizing figures from West Virginia which is the only state located entirely within the region. In 1969 the annual expenditure per pupil in West Virginia was $593 as compared to the national average of $741. However, the average for the region as a whole was no doubt somewhat lower than $593, particularly in Central and Southern Appalachia, for each of the states which lie within these subregions spent less money per pupil than West Virginia with the lone exception of Virginia.[42]

---

[38] President's Appalachian Regional Commission, Appalachia, p. 10.

[39] Archie R. Dykes, "A Study of Public School Finance in the Southern Appalachian Region" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1959).

[40] Rupert Vance, "The Region's Future: A National Challenge," The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962), p. 298.

Inadequate Educational Facilities

The lack of adequate finances is naturally reflected in poor educational facilities. While many of the urban school districts have not fared too badly in this respect, the same cannot be said of rural facilities. The Educational Advisory Committee of the Appalachian Regional Commission has also indicated that poor management practices as well as insufficient funds are partially responsible for inadequate facilities:

---

[41] Donohew and Parker, p. 4.

[42] U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Educational Statistics, Fall 1969 Statistics of Public Schools, Advance Report (Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1970), p. 5.

> As in most areas of public investment, there is no provision for amortization of building costs over a period of time and no depreciation of facilities and equipment. Few states keep up-to-date records concerning the condition of school facilities and few general standards of facility maintenance and minimum requirements exist other than the normal health and safety requirements.[43]

A recent survey indicated that a considerable number of Appalachian teachers felt that the educational facilities and materials shown in Table 1 are either inadequate or lacking entirely in their schools.

The number of one and two room schools in Appalachia far surpasses that in any comparable area of the nation. As of 1967 there are still 1,046 such schools in the region.[44] Though all are not extremely inadequate, the majority are. Most of these rural schools fit the following description by Peter Schrag:

> Many are built of wooden slats, though some have been replaced since World War II with cinder block structures--usually because "the old school

---

[43] The Appalachian Regional Commission Education Advisory Committee Interim Report, p. 13.

[44] Vincent P. Skinner, "Mountaineers Aren't Really Illiterate," Southern Education Report III (July/August, 1967), 18.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF APPALACHIAN TEACHERS INDICATING THAT VARIOUS EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES AND MATERIALS WERE EITHER INADEQUATE OR NON-EXISTENT IN THEIR SCHOOLS*

Facilities and Materials	Percentage of Teachers
Auditorium	57
Science Equipment	52
Recreation space and facilities	51
Science laboratory	50
Language laboratory	50
Health facilities	48
Audio-visual material	47
Electrical outlets	47
Audio-visual equipment	45
Library (physical setting only)	44
Library materials	43
Lunch room	42
Toilet facilities	37
Ventilation	37
Classroom size	34

---

*The Appalachian Regional Commission Research Report No. 12: Teachers in Appalachia (Washington: Appalachian Regional Commission, 1970), p. 7.

> burned down." The pot bellied stove and the outdoor privy are the only standard pieces of equipment. A miscellany of old desks, benches, tables, and chairs comprise the furniture; decorations come from old magazines and calendars.[45]

In some cases the consolidated rural school is not much better than the one and two room schools as is indicated by the experience of a junior high teacher in southern West Virginia:

> Her school building has rats in the basement, the heat works only sometimes, the water taps are temperamental, and shattered windows are left unrepaired for at least a month. In her crowded general math class, several of the 45 pupils are forced to sit in the windowsills, unless others are absent. She thinks the algebra textbook is too difficult, but she could only get 40 review books for 100 students.[46]

Profile of the Rural Appalachian School

The schools of rural Appalachia suffer from a number of other inadequacies in addition to those which stem from limited financial support and poor facilities. In many ways the nonfinancial problems are the most damaging in terms of the school's failure to become an effective force in the development of large scale individuals.

---

[45] Peter Schrag, "The Schools of Appalachia," Saturday Review XLVII (May 15, 1965), 70.

[46] Suzanne Crowell, "They Stayed," American Education V (August/September, 1969), 23.

A Closed System

Foremost among the barriers to change which are inherent in the existing educational system is the fact that the rural school is a "closed" rather than an "open" institution. This is, of course, a natural result of the school being a part of, and, therefore, reflecting a "closed" social system. The school is "closed" in the sense that it is staffed for the most part by natives of the community or region who generally adhere closely to local values and beliefs while making little, if any, attempt to expose students to the patterns of existence which prevail in the larger American society. It both reflects and perpetuates the Appalachian status quo rather than concerning itself with the development of a program which is designed to deal with the problems of the people it serves. As Ogletree has stated, "Appalachian schools have been unable to, or even unconcerned with, breaking with the educational 'is' to move toward the 'ought to be.'"[47]

The Curriculum and the Quality of Instruction

The curriculum and instructional practices which characterize the typical school in rural Appalachia reflect the intellectual inbreeding and apathy which pervade the entire educational system. Limited facilities and small faculties provide an excuse for the lack of a comprehensive curriculum, but they do not justify the maintenance of an instructional program which is totally irrelevant for most rural Appalachian students. While the school must adhere as closely as possible to the curriculum regulations established by the state, such regulations often have little effect upon the nature or the quality of the learning experiences which are provided within the framework of state requirements. Having visited several rural schools in Appalachia, Schrag commented on the quality of the instruction he observed there:

---

[47] James R. Ogletree, Appalachian Schools--A Case of Consistency (Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1968), p. 5.

> To a visitor in the mountain schools, the discourse in the classroom has a kind of somnambulistic unreality about it, almost as if the participants were playing school or performing a little play purporting to represent real education. No one knows his lines well because the dialogue is about something far away and not understood by the participants: the French revolution, or the mechanics of city government as described in a civics text, or the economics of market capitalism as imagined by the Chamber of Commerce in 1928. Textbook cliches abound and no one makes much effort to relate them even to the limited experiences of the students in the class.[48]

The irrelevance and inflexibility of the curriculum is further illustrated by the fact that it is structured to a large extent around the antiquated idea that education means preparation for college and little else.[49] The lack of realism in such an attitude becomes even more apparent when one realizes that only one out of ten high school graduates in the region enters a college or university.[50] Not only is it a tragedy that educational programs in the rural schools are primarily appropriate for college preparation, but the tragedy is compounded by the fact that the schools fail in their mission of providing adequate preparation for those who do attend college. Such vocational offerings as do exist often provide training for declining occupations.[51]

---

[48] Schrag, Appalachian Review I (Fall, 1966), 6-7.

It is rather obvious, given existing educational conditions in the region, that the schools have done little to affect those changes which are necessary to develop a curriculum which is capable of meeting the social, economic, and cultural needs of children who will find it necessary to participate in tomorrow's world. In fact there is little evidence to indicate that the educational system is either capable or willing to produce such change from within. Systematic curriculum development activities are practically non-existent. There are few curriculum supervisors, and many districts have no written policies or procedures. It has been estimated that less than 5 per cent of the Appalachian school districts in Kentucky have any curriculum guides other than those supplied by the state department of education.[52] The results of such a haphazard and informal treatment of curriculum considerations has resulted in the development of practices and attitudes such as those described below by Ogletree and Carmichael:

---

[49] Graff, p. 199 and Anderson, Journal of Marriage and the Family XXVI (November, 1964), 445.

[50] Branscome, Appalachia II (May, 1969), 16.

[51] The Appalachian Regional Commission Education Advisory Committee Interim Report, p. 37.

> . . . the instructional program has often been that of teachers and textbooks with only the teacher deciding what to teach and when.
>
> Many school administrators with some embarrassment admit that their instructional program is left to chance with only the state approved textbooks and course requirements as safeguards that students are studying "what they should."[53]
>
> The curriculum and program of instruction are things that "are" rather than things to be "worked on." Little is done to provide curricular or instructional guidance to the teacher. Even new programs initiated at the state level often are implemented only with reference to what the local citizenry might or might not accept. A major portion of administrative attention is devoted to management, finances, and the avoidance of controversy.[54]

Thus, a static curriculum continues to exist year after year without benefit of serious thought on the part of those who are responsible for its operation. An unchanging instructional program in the form of a list of irrelevant courses has become both the end and means of education in rural Appalachia.

---

[52] Ogletree, p. 8.

[53] *Ibid*., p. 10.

[54] Benjamin E. Carmichael, "Impacts on Education in Regional Areas," *Educational Leadership* XXVI (October, 1968), 18.

Such a deplorable situation is naturally troubling to anyone who is truly concerned with educational excellence, but the description of educational irrelevance and inflexibility which has been presented above can hardly relate in an adequate way the depressing consequences which await the Appalachian children who make up the impersonal lists of statistics indicating the failure of the rural school to touch their lives in a meaningful way. For most of these children, the future promises to be as bleak as that of the generation which preceeded them, and unless change occurs rapidly the generation which follows them will fare no better. The tragedy of the educational malaise is heightened by the fact that a majority of Appalachian children are capable of profiting from a relevant school experience that will develop their potential. While social and cultural isolation has naturally imposed limitations upon them--they are of normal intelligence.[55] Although those who are responsible for education in rural Appalachia are for the most part aware of the intellectual abilities of the mountain child, they seem to ignore the fact that the low achievement levels of students and the weak holding power of the school are directly related to the failure of the school to provide learning experiences which offset rather than perpetuate limitations imposed by the traditional subculture of the region. For a variety of reasons, which will be dealt with in a subsequent chapter describing the culture of rural Appalachia, mountain children are difficult to teach if one relies on traditional methods and materials. A large part of this difficulty stems from their lack of motivation to learn.[56] Again much of this is cultural, but it is also necessary to remember that there are very few things around these children which indicate that education is worthwhile. Given the needs and the nature of rural Appalachian children, the continued refusal of the school to recognize or heed the need for curriculum reform represents the worst feature of the "closed" educational system.

---

[55] For studies dealing with the intellectual capabilities of Appalachian children see Frank H. Hooper and Suzanne Skinto, "Surveying the Appalachian Child," Appalachian Advance III (March, 1969), 27-29; "Characteristics of Rural Tennessee School Children," Appalachia III (August, 1970), 16; K. Warner Schaie, The 1965 Head Start Psychological Screening Program (Morgantown, West Virginia: Human Resources Research Institute, West Virginia University, 1967), p. 36.

[56] For observations concerning the lack of motivation among Appalachian students see Branscome, Appalachia II (May, 1969), 16-17; Peterson, Southern Education Report V (March, 1969), 3; Weller, pp. 110-11.

The Professional Staff

It is felt by many educators that the major variable involved in the determination of the quality of an educational system is the presence of a capable and dedicated staff. Inadequacies in facilities and equipment can conceivably be offset by competent administrators and teachers who are committed to educational excellence. Without unjustly labeling all rural Appalachian educators incompetent, existing conditions strongly suggest the absence of the type of educational leadership which is capable of ensuring a brighter future for the region.

Administrators in Appalachia are, for the most part, natives of the districts which they serve.[57] They are not very mobile as is indicated by the fact that as of 1964 86 per cent of the superintendents in Southern Appalachia had held only one superintendency.[58] In general, superintendents throughout the region tend to be older than their counterparts across the nation when they receive their first position,[59] and their educational preparation is decidedly inferior to that received by most superintendents throughout the country.[60] On the basis of a study of Appalachian superintendents Taylor concluded that "the average superintendent in Southern Appalachia or in West Virginia does not bring to his position the kinds of educational experiences deemed essential to the growth and fulfillment of the educational enterprise that today's leaders in education and public administrators recommend."[61]

---

[57] Ogletree, p. 8.

[58] Daniel B. Taylor, "An Assessment of the Characteristics, Education, and Training of Public School Superintendents in Southern Appalachia and in West Virginia" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, West Virginia University, 1965), p. 39.

The local orientation of school administrators and their inferior preparation does much to prevent them from exerting any influence in the direction of educational change. Many superintendents and principals have become guardians of the "closed" system they oversee, and their decisions are generally consistent with local cultural values rather than obvious needs, even in those cases where sound professional judgment would dictate otherwise. Nor is it likely that such conservative attitudes will be offset to any great extent by the impact of educational developments elsewhere, for as Ogletree has pointed out, few Appalachian administrators attend national or even regional professional meetings.[62] This lack of concern for new ideas and opinions relevant to educational change is also apparent in the reading habits of regional administrators. Taylor found that periodicals which often emphasize current educational ideas such as Saturday Review, New York Times Magazine, Harpers, Atlantic Monthly, The American Scholar, and The New Republic were rarely, if ever, read by Appalachian superintendents.[63]

---

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid., pp. 47-49.

[61] Ibid., p. 96.

In addition to the fact that most administrators provide little leadership in terms of stimulating needed changes, many of them seem to be incapable of even maintaining the present level of educational development. Instead they operate in a manner which can only contribute to further deterioration within the system. Incompetent teachers are rarely fired unless they also happen to be the target of community criticism, problems are discussed in meeting after meeting but no action is taken, and long range planning remains an unknown concept.[64]

While the problems cited above present serious barriers to educational improvement, none of them produces results as detrimental as those which derive from the unfortunate mixture of politics and education which pervade the school system in Appalachia.[65] For decades the rural school has represented not only an educational institution but a political institution as well. In some school districts the local superintendent is elected while in others he is appointed by an elected board of education. However, despite the method by which he is chosen, he often becomes a political figure. The economic conditions of the region and the political nature of the educational leadership structure have resulted in the schools becoming the foundation of a vast local patronage system with the superintendent as its overlord.

---

[62] Ogletree, p. 8.

[63] Taylor, p. 82.

[64] Ogletree, p. 9.

Schools mean jobs for teachers, clerks, janitors, bus drivers, and lunchroom employees. In a region where kinship and political loyalties overshadow the abstractions of political and educational ethics, the superintendent often takes advantage of the economic situation and maintains his power by virtue of his control over contracts for insurance, fuel, supplies, buses, and construction, as well as employment within the system. Therefore, teachers and other employees are often hired because they are trusted friends or relatives or for the number of votes they can deliver rather than on the basis of their qualifications, and scarce educational funds are utilized as political rewards rather than in the manner which is best calculated to bring about improvement in the classroom.[66]

---

[65] For a thorough description of a typical example of the influence of politics on education in Appalachia see Carter County, Kentucky: A Study of an Unconscionable Combination of Politics and Education, A Report Prepared by the National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities of the National Education Association of the United States and the Kentucky Education Association (Washington: National Education Association, 1963). Other studies which note the unfortunate relationship between politics and education in the region include Graff, p. 190; Bowman and Plunkett, p. 165; Caudill, pp. 336-37; Ogletree, pp. 8-9; Schrag, Appalachian Review I (Fall, 1966), 7-10; Peterson, Southern Education Report IV (March, 1969), 4; W. Warren Haynes and Mary J. Bowman, Resources and People in East Kentucky (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1963), pp. 279-80.

Political dynasties are built by superintendents in many areas throughout Appalachia. Schrag has described an example which serves to typify a situation that exists in all too many Appalachian school systems:

> In Breathitt County, for example, Mrs. Marie Turner has been superintendent of schools since 1931; her husband held the office for six years before, and several in-laws controlled it before that. The Turners own the building in which the Board of Education is located, and they take rent from the Board. According to the Lexington Leader, which ran a series of articles on school politics in Kentucky--with little apparent effect--the Turners have profitted from the schools' purchase of coal, gasoline, and school buses, and from the deposit of school funds in local banks.[67]

Obviously politically-minded school administrators who are primarily concerned with self-maintenance are not apt to jeopardize their position by attempting to revolutionize the school system. To suddenly become a champion of school reform would be looked upon as an admission by the superintendent that the system over which he presides is inadequate in some respects. Such unexpected action would also tend to anger those individuals in the community who are quite satisfied with things the way they are, particularly those who profit in some way from the patronage system or the fact that the population remains undereducated, apathetic, and open to exploitation.

---

[66] Schrag, Saturday Review XLVII (May 15, 1965), 71.

[67] Ibid.

Poor educational leadership is, of course, detrimental to any school system, but it proves to be doubly harmful in Appalachia where future development depends to a very large extent upon the success or failure of efforts designed to change the static social and economic equilibrium which characterizes the present. The school, poor as it is, seems to be the one local institution which has the potential to aid in this process of change. Unfortunately under the present administrative leadership the school often serves only to hinder the process.

Like administrators, most teachers in the schools of rural Appalachia are natives of the region, if not the community in which they teach.[68] This is not unusual when one considers the strong family ties characteristic of

---

[68] Ogletree, p. 7.

Appalachia, as well as the widespread nepotism and the preference of both school boards and community for "local folks" rather than outsiders.

Not only are most Appalachian teachers brought up in the region, but many of them also receive their training in regional institutions. Ogletree offers an illustration by pointing out that in one Appalachian county 85 per cent of the instructional staff had attended college within a seventy-five mile radius of their community and then returned home to teach.[69] A recent survey made for the Appalachian Regional Commission indicates how widespread intellectual inbreeding is within the ranks of the region's teachers:

> Appalachian teachers have typically gained their education and experience in Appalachia. Eighty-three per cent of them have completed most of their high school years in the state in which they are now teaching. Ninety per cent of those with bachelor's degrees received them in one of the Appalachian states. More than eighty per cent of them have spent all of their teaching years in the same state. Ninety-two per cent were born in one of the Appalachian states.[70]

Thus the "closed" system perpetuates itself. New ideas are not brought into the school, and there is an absence of the intellectual give and take generated by different backgrounds and perspectives. Therefore, the mind of an Appalachian child is not stimulated or challenged by unfamiliar values and beliefs which present alternatives to the only cultural tradition he has ever known.

---

[69] Ibid.

[70] The Appalachian Regional Commission Research Report No. 12: Teachers in Appalachia, p. 4.

Teachers in Appalachia also tend to be less well prepared than those in other parts of the nation. Approximately 7 per cent have three years of college training or less. This includes a small number who have only a high school education. Somewhere between 13 and 21 per cent are not fully certified. Fewer than 89 per cent have a bachelor's degree, and only 19 per cent hold a master's degree. Seventeen per cent of Appalachian teachers have not taken a college course within the last three years, 12 per cent have not taken such a course in the last six years, and 13 per cent were last in a college class over ten years ago. Almost 24 per cent have never received any type of in-service training.[71]

While degrees, certification, and in-service training are no guarantee of teaching excellence, statistics related to these factors as they apply to Appalachia do suggest that many teachers in the region are probably out of touch with recent educational developments and that there is a definite tendency for teacher preparation, like other aspects of Appalachian education, to be somewhat inferior when compared to the quality of teacher preparation across the nation. The fact that Appalachian teachers are less well prepared than others may or may not help explain the educational malaise of the region, but it does serve to add another variable to the several possibilities already discussed.

---

[71] _Ibid_., pp. 31-45.

The quality of instruction in Appalachia is also affected by large numbers of teachers leaving the region. Unfortunately it is the young and better educated teacher who tends to migrate,[72] and this has often resulted in vacancies being filled by less qualified people. It has been estimated that two-thirds of those trained in Appalachian colleges as teachers leave the region upon graduation,[73] while 70 per cent of the young teachers in Appalachia leave after their first four years in the classroom.[74] The rural schools naturally suffer most in this respect.

Given the poor facilities and low salaries which characterize the educational system of Appalachia, the heavy teacher migration is not surprising. Although salaries have risen considerably in parts of Appalachia during the past few years, the average salary in 1968-69 was still only $6,900. The average for teachers in small towns and rural schools was even lower than the regional average. When one considers that the average salary of teachers in the nation as a whole was $1,000 greater than in Appalachia, it is easy to see why the region has problems in retaining instructional personnel.[75]

---

[72] Ibid., p. 82.

[73] Carmichael, Educational Leadership XXVI (October, 1968), 18.

[74] Branscome, Appalachia II (May, 1969), 16.

As one might expect on the basis of the foregoing discussion, Appalachian teachers do not represent a potent force for change. In fact, many of them seem to see no necessity for any drastic change in the present system; those who do perceive the need for widespread improvement will often say very little for fear of being banished to a one room school where they can cause little trouble.[76] Weller has criticized the conservatism of Appalachian education by stating that "educators are the ones who are most defensive about their present setup. They would rather believe that their system is not doing badly, when actually they are comparing their system not with the national average, but with those in neighboring counties."[77] Nor is there much hope that rural Appalachian teachers will become advocates of change in the immediate future, for according to Plunkett, "if we judge by age-characteristics of the present teaching force, prospects for their future improvements in orientations that would bridge cultural gaps and reach out to the wider society are gloomy."[78] Thus, teachers, like administrators, in the rural schools of Appalachia often prove to be a major obstacle to the development of an educational system which is capable of contributing to regional improvement.

---

[75] The Appalachian Regional Commission Research Report No. 12: Teachers in Appalachia, p. 8.

[76] Schrag, Saturday Review XLVIII (May 15, 1965), 70-71.

[77] Jack E. Weller, "Many Educators Won't Accept Help," Newsfocus: AEL (undated newsletter published by the Appalachian Educational Laboratory, Charleston, West Virginia), pp. 10-11.

The Need for a Unique and Innovative Solution

Just as poverty in Appalachia is a self-perpetuating cycle, so too is the poor quality of education in the region. Continued isolation has produced a static cultural equilibrium which has crippled the ability and willingness of the people to respond effectively to the host of problems that ultimately spelled economic disaster for the region. The educational system has consistently reflected that static equilibrium, and like the culture it has failed to adapt to the demands made upon it by the social and economic conditions that characterize Appalachia. Not only has the educational system failed to adapt successfully, but it has perpetuated its failure by isolating itself from new ideas. Worse still, it has hidden its failure and ensured the continuation of mediocrity by persuading the people of the region that it is doing an adequate job of educating Appalachian children. One must admit that the failure of the school derives in large part from the fact that it is a creature of the "closed" society it serves. However, it is also necessary to recognize the hypocrisy involved in the schools' pretensions of adequacy when it is failing to provide Appalachian children with the skills that will enable them to satisfy the desire for a higher standard of living which both they and their parents are beginning to believe can be achieved only through education.

---

[78] Bowman and Plunkett, p. 167.

Given the conditions described throughout this chapter, it is rather obvious that little can be expected from the existing educational system in terms of enlarging the scale of rural Appalachians and thus providing them with the prerequisites of success in the modern world. The perpetuation of the present system of education can only mean that those who choose to migrate from the region will continue to find life in the larger society difficult at best, and that those who remain behind will continue to lack the knowledge and ability to contribute to regional development. The preservation of the rural school as it presently exists means simply the preservation of the Appalachian status quo. Carse has described the close relationship between the Appalachian school and the status quo by stating:

> In the midst of culture change, institutionalized education must prepare to change more significantly than its society. For it is the very institution of

> education that, in many parts of our nation and the world, helps to maintain the lack of change. Any casual observer of the schools of Eastern Kentucky, for instance, will realize immediately that little change will take place in youngsters who spend one, eight, or twelve years within their walls. The buildings are as uninspiring as are others in the community. The classrooms are barren. The teachers are unimaginative. No wonder that the end product is an exact replication of the group of adults that walks around outside. For change to take place, the schools must represent the larger world as a desirable place for the child to enter, not an unknown and frightening something beyond the mountains.[79]

Thus, it should strike no one as surprising that many of those who are concerned with education in rural Appalachia find little reason for hoping that minor changes and improvements in the educational system will enable it to realize its potential as a cultural bridge to the larger society. The educational problems of the region are both grave and somewhat unique, for they reflect a unique subculture. Given the uniqueness and the gravity of these problems, it does not appear that they are susceptible to solution by reliance upon the conventional methods of promoting educational improvement. The situation has led the Education Advisory Committee of the Appalachian Regional Commission to note the need for an innovative approach to rural education in the region:

---

[79] William Carse, "Teacher Education in Culture Change," Culture Change, Mental Health and Poverty, ed. Joseph C. Finney (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1969), p. 117.

> The differences between the family, culture, social setting, mores, etc. of the urban and the Appalachian youth are demonstrable and significant. The educational effects of these differences, however, have not been studied. We can only say that the character of the "deprived" Appalachian probably demands a different system and different approach to education. . . .
>
> One thing is very apparent. The isolation from even knowledge of opportunity and the passive acceptance of the current state of affairs, coupled with limited resources, demands that the Appalachian youth receive a greater amount and variety of information than his city counterpart.[80]

Benjamin E. Carmichael, the Director of the Appalachian Educational Laboratory, has also emphasized the necessity for a different approach to Appalachian educational problems:

> The problem is simply that major changes in education which would affect the region and offer a breakthrough in educational practices cannot be implemented through the existing structure of education using the conventional approaches to change and improvement. Regional isolation and geographic barriers within the region preclude the progress that is needed immediately. . . .
>
> . . . Facilities cannot be updated rapidly enough. Personnel cannot be trained sufficiently. There is not enough receptivity, know-how, and skill to stimulate and employ research findings. There is not sufficient time or resources for adequate educational development by the grass roots approach . . . and conventional approaches everywhere are being seriously questioned.
>
> . . . We must not expend our resources to do Those things which are commonly being done; our

---

[80] The Appalachian Regional Commission Education Advisory Committee Interim Report, pp. 6-7.

> aim must not be to patch up education; we need not try to catch up; we must strive to reconstruct education.[81]

Evidence of the failure of conventional methods to improve education in the region can be seen in the lack of significant impact generated by programs which have been initiated by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Head Start, and the Teachers Corps. Even the innovative-minded Appalachian Educational Laboratory which is attempting to utilize the latest technology as the basis of a revolution in regional education has been criticized for failing to promote appreciable progress.[82] One might also add that the potential impact of federal educational programs has been offset to some degree by the fact that Appalachian school districts do not have enough money to take full advantage of programs which require matching funds.[83]

Some educators have promoted the consolidated school with a comprehensive program as a panacea for the region.[84] Others see vocational education as the cure for all educational ills. However, geographic and demographic problems make consolidation virtually impossible in some parts of Appalachia. It is also difficult to persuade many rural Appalachians to give up their local schools in exchange for a consolidated one because of the strong provincialism that still prevails in the region.[85] More importantly, perhaps, several studies indicate that some mountain children, particularly those from the most isolated areas, suffer psychological and emotional damage when forced to attend a consolidated school.[86]

---

[81] Carmichael, Educational Leadership XXVI (October, 1968), 19.

[82] Peterson, Southern Education Report IV (March, 1969), 7-9.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[84] Graff, pp. 192-193 and Anderson, Journal of Marriage and the Family XXVI (November, 1964), 445.

Despite the fact that the Appalachian Regional Commission is allocating a majority of its educational funds for the construction of vocational schools,[87] there are a number of knowledgeable people who insist that occupational training is not going to solve either the educational problems or the manpower development problems of the region. Zeller and Smith, both of whom are economists at the Appalachian Center of West Virginia University, go so far as to state that "vocational technical training in

---

[85] Anderson, Journal of Marriage and the Family XXVI (November, 1964), 445, and Carolyn Boiarsky, "Updating Education in Appalachia," Audiovisual Instruction XII (December, 1968), 1096.

[86] Gazaway, p. 221; Mental Health in Appalachia: Problems and Prospects in the Highlands, pp. 9-10; David H. Looff, "The Psychiatric Perspective on Poverty," Poverty: New Interdisciplinary Perspectives, ed. Thomas Weaver and Alvin Magid (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1969), p. 123.

[87] "A Look at Vocational Education in Appalachia," Appalachia III (August, 1970), 1-8.

Appalachia is not the answer. It is questionable if it is an answer."[88] They point out that current research indicates that a good general education is by far the best approach to manpower development.[89] Their point of view is supported by a number of other people both in the field of education and manpower development.[90]

The failure of conventional methods so often utilized to improve the educational system of rural Appalachia can be traced in large part to the fact that planners rarely seem to take into account the cultural factors which are primarily responsible for the inadequacies of the system. Too many programs have been implemented in Appalachian schools simply because they worked elsewhere; yet Appalachia's educational problems do not generally stem from the same set of circumstances that created those faced by other school systems.

Nor has there been an attempt to implement improvement efforts which concentrate on enlarging the scale of students at all four levels. Most existing programs have been aimed at improvements only on the technological and cultural levels, while ignoring the sociological and psychological limitations of rural students. While such programs are a decided improvement over many of the traditional approaches to education and thus may open the door to modernity; they are generally incapable of providing students with all of the skills and attitudes necessary either to prompt them to cross the threshold or to enable them to experience a smooth transition if they should decide to participate in the larger society.

---

[88] Frederick A. Zeller and Wil J. Smith, "Manpower Problems in Appalachia," The Journal of Industrial Arts Education XXIX (March/April, 1970), p. 31.

[89] Ibid., pp. 31-34.

[90] A number of articles which support this position can be found in Frederick A. Zeller and Robert W. Miller (eds.), Manpower Development in Appalachia: An Approach to Unemployment (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968) and The Journal of Industrial Arts Education XXIX (March/April, 1970).

Given the fact that the schools of rural Appalachia have obviously failed to provide both past and present generations of mountain youth with a relevant education and attempts to alter the situation have not resulted in significant improvement, the need for a unique and imaginative solution to the educational malaise of the region remains very much in evidence. The writer has maintained that a useful method of viewing the aims which should be pursued by the school if it is to promote meaningful change in the region is in terms of increasing the scale of the rural Appalachian. While the concept of scale provides a more clearly defined set of educational objectives than those upon which educational planners of the region have generally focused their attention, its value does not end at that point. If the close relationship between the cultural tradition of rural Appalachia and regional educational problems exists, as the writer has contended, then the analytical model based on scale also provides a conceptual tool which can be utilized by educational planners to probe that relationship and isolate those cultural variables that are primarily responsible for educational difficulties. Information derived from the cultural analysis can be utilized as a set of guidelines which can do much to provide direction in the design of an educational system which is capable of enlarging both individual and regional scale. In view of the writer's contentions, it would seem appropriate at this point to turn to a description of the traditional subculture of rural Appalachia with particular emphasis being placed on those cultural features which are closely related to the social, economic, and educational dilemmas of the region.

CHAPTER IV

THE RURAL APPALACHIAN SUBCULTURE

Introduction

Before commencing with the description of the culture of rural Appalachia, it seems advisable in the interest of both clarity and objectivity to reiterate some important points made thus far in the study. It is also necessary to interject several additional introductory remarks in order to convey an understanding of both the writer's intent and the limitations which are involved in the following description of the rural Appalachian subculture. Mention has previously been made of the fact that serious students of the Appalachian scene are quite aware of the social and cultural diversity which exists in the region.[1] Therefore, while it is necessary to recognize that the traditional culture has probably influenced most of the people born and raised in the region to some degree, a valid description of Appalachian society requires that the dual nature of life in the region be recognized. Many of the common stereotypes of Appalachia and its people stem from articles published in popular periodicals which are based on extremely superficial studies of the region. Such articles generally ignore the fact that millions of people in Appalachia reflect a modern way of life.

---

[1] Chapter I, p. 19.

It should also be noted that a considerable amount of change has taken place in the region during the past two decades.[2] While numerous problems from the past still exist and new ones are being constantly created by the influx of modernization, parts of Appalachia, particularly in the northern and southern subregions, are moving into the mainstream of American life. Despite the continued existence of a number of cultural dysfunctions, a large part of Appalachian society has passed the point of near disintegration.

Although signs of change, progress, and modernization must not be ignored by those who seek to understand life in Appalachia, neither should such signs lead one to minimize the malaise of the region, particularly in Central Appalachia. Rural Appalachian society is a society in transition and as such it continues to exhibit serious problems which deserve continued attention. Therefore, while the writer fully recognizes that a thorough and objective assessment of life in Appalachia requires that attention be given to both evidence of progress and change as well as the problematical aspects of the region, the nature of this study precludes such a thorough treatment. Given the purpose of this study, it is necessary that the description of the rural Appalachian subculture be largely confined to those aspects of the cultural tradition which are negative in the sense that they tend to place serious limitations on the ability of many people to develop a life style which is compatible with modern life. Attention has also been limited only to those people who continue to be heavily influenced by the traditional rural subculture. All of the foregoing points have been reiterated to emphasize once again that it is not the writer's intention to either ignore the change and progress which has taken place in the region or to imply that all those who reside in Appalachia are a homogenous group in a cultural sense. The obvious limitations of the approach employed in treating the rural Appalachian subculture derive from the writer's desire to utilize a simple method of focusing on those people and those problems which require attention if the region as a whole is to advance toward modernity with a minimum of cultural dislocation.

---

[2] Harry K. Schwartweller, "Social Change and the Individual in Rural Appalachia," pp. 51-65.

It should also be noted at this point that in the interest of clarity and organizational cohesiveness no attempt has been made in this chapter to relate educational problems to the cultural factors from which they stem, nor has mention of the relationship of cultural factors to the concept of scale been made except in infrequent cases. The succeeding chapter will deal with these relationships. However, scale has been utilized by the writer as a conceptual tool during the survey of the literature on Appalachia and the selection of the data which seemed most pertinent to an understanding of the subculture of rural Appalachia in terms of the limitations it places on many of the region's people. Given the large amount of data on the region, the scale model proved to be invaluable in determining the relevance of such data to the particular problems with which this study is concerned. This is not to say that data which might dispute the concept of scale was ignored or rejected, but simply that all evidence which bears on the problem under study was more easily isolated and its relevance to the problem more clearly indicated.

The Historical Development of Appalachia

A comprehensive treatment of the historical development of Appalachia goes beyond the scope and purpose of this study. However, an abbreviated account of the region's history is vital to an understanding of the unique subculture which emerged during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and to the social and economic problems of the region which are closely related to that subculture and its limitations.

The original settlers in the mountainous areas of

Appalachia came from a variety of places and were not entirely homogenous, but they tended to have a rather common background in that many of them were poor, unskilled, and quite often the victims of some form of exploitation either in Europe or in other parts of the English colonies in America. Prior to the American Revolution the English gentry in Georgia, Virginia, and the Carolinas were constantly in need of cheap labor for their plantations. Slave traders could not satisfy the burgeoning need for laborers, so the landholders turned to Parliament for help. The British government eager to rid the country of numerous social outcasts, passed a series of acts which in combination with the propaganda of the planters about life in the New World made it easy to transport large numbers of indentured servants to America. Thousands of debtors, thieves, and orphans found their way to the plantations of the South in this manner.[3]

Toil on the plantations was often extremely oppressive, and many of the indentured class began to run away to the interior and gradually work their way into the mountain country where they would be safe from pursuit. Others, having completed their obligations under the indenture laws, found they could not find jobs because of the growing number of slaves and also migrated into the mountainous backcountry. By the time the colonies freed themselves from English rule the fringe areas of the Southern Appalachians were populated primarily by the unfortunate victims of the indenture laws. Eventually the descendants of these people spread throughout the mountains of Southern and Central Appalachia.[4]

---

[3] Caudill, pp. 4-5.

Other groups came into the mountains under somewhat different but equally unfortunate circumstances. Large numbers of Scotch-Irish migrated to America from Northern Ireland during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries because of religious prosecution and economic depression. Many of them settled temporarily in Pennsylvania and then began to move gradually into the backcountry of Virginia, Georgia, and the Carolinas. By the 1770's they were pushing into the mountain country of Kentucky and Tennessee. A large proportion of those who followed this particular path of migration were those who had failed to establish a successful farm or business somewhere along the route. As a result they were for the most part representative of the large mass of poor whites that was developing in the South.[5]

Following the opening of the Cumberland Turnpike in 1818, settlers desiring to move westward had easier access to the Ohio River. Many of the migrants traversing this route particularly those who sought a stable life, settled along the Ohio or Mississippi Rivers or they continued on to the rich lands beyond these rivers. However, some of the settlers who came down the Ohio began to move into the highlands of Appalachia. This group tended to be more interested in a life free from rules and regulations than in a stable society. Many of them had come to America embittered by life in Europe, and they sought to escape from the coastal areas which had established a life style quite similar to that which prevailed in England, Scotland, and Ireland.[6]

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[5] Herman R. Lantz, "Resignation, Industrialization, and the Problem of Social Change: A Case History of a Coal-Mining Community," *Blue Collar World: Studies of the American Worker*, ed. Arthur Shostak and William Gomberg (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), pp. 260-61.

Thus, in contrast to the type of society which had developed in other parts of the English holdings in America, Appalachian society was composed to a large extent of the poor, the unskilled, the exploited, and those who resented law, order, and authority. The results have been described by Weller:

> They were determined to establish a life as free from contact with law and restraint as possible. In rebellion against a form of government that imposed its rule from the top, these people reverted to a system of private justice based on the personal relationships common to the clan. They thus developed a general ideology of leveling--a system that gave equal status to all and that recognized no authority other than the force of an individual. No hierarchy, authorities, or experts were allowed to form in this society, no pressure from outside was allowed to gain entrance.

---

[6] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 10-11.

> . . . Their difference in fundamental psychology from the other settlers who moved west began the accidents of history, environment, and circumstance which have led the southern highlander to a profound separation from his fellow countrymen in the rest of the nation.[7]

The isolation of life in Appalachia required that its people be virtually self-sufficient. At first game, fish, and fruit were abundant, and from the Indians they learned a great deal about surviving in such an environment. However, as the population grew and game became less abundant it became necessary to clear land and plant crops. Unfortunately, the Appalachian settler was not prepared to be a farmer, nor was the steep land suited to agriculture. Many of those who had emigrated to other parts of America came from areas in Europe which were aware of the importance of soil conservation, and they were familiar with other advanced ideas in agriculture. However, those who settled in Appalachia had been born and raised in an English city or they came from Scotland or Ireland where agricultural science was in a primitive stage when compared to other European nations. Even those who had worked on the plantations prior to their migration into the mountains had learned little about proper agricultural practices, for little attempt was made by the planters to conserve the soil. Having no other source of guidance, the mountaineer relied on the agricultural techniques he learned from the

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

Indians. The result was disaster for the land.[8] When one plot of land was exhausted another was cleared and more and more of the limited amount of fertile bottom land was rendered useless. Bad as the destruction of the best agricultural land was, the ensuing destruction of the hillsides above them was even worse. The destructive agricultural practices of the Appalachian farmer, described below by Caudill, did not cease even when it became evident that they were disastrous:

> The bottoms had long since been cleared and thousands of acres of corn were annually planted on hillside clearings. The mountaineer knew nothing about fertilizer or cover crops. . . . His system of plowing and planting, hoeing and harvesting was extremely exhausting to the soil, and the winter rains fell year after year upon crop lands unprotected by winter cover. . . . While the coves were on the gentlest slopes to be found on the hillside, they were, notwithstanding, steeply angled and when summer thunderstorms smote them with sudden downpours, mold was washed away, sometimes as much as two inches at a time. . . . Out of necessity he then authorized the clearing of even steeper and higher lands. . . . These fields were less fertile initially and . . . washed away even more quickly. Thousands of such acres were cleared though rarely could more than a single crop be expected.[9]

Such practices continued decade after decade clear into the twentieth century until profitable farming in most of the region is now an impossibility. In 1964 the President's Appalachian Regional Commission estimated that 95 per cent of the cropland and 75 per cent of the pastureland is in need of conservation measures.[10]

---

[8] President's Appalachian Regional Commission, Appalachia, p. 19.

[9] Caudill, pp. 82-83.

The harsh environment of the mountains and the lack of agricultural skill among the population ultimately dictated a very low level subsistence type economy for most of the region, and the passage of time which witnessed an increase of the population and continued depletion of the soil brought with it a constantly worsening economic situation. Mountain families were not only large but, due to the terrain and the lack of transportation facilities, they tended to remain close together even after the children were grown. Thus, each generation found less and poorer land to farm as the best plots were held by older generations. The result could only be a steadily declining standard of living for all.[11]

Not only did the environment help prevent the development of a viable economy, but it also contributed to a pattern of settlement which imposed a stifling social and cultural isolation on the region. Communities and farms were scattered haphazardly across the countryside in whatever valley or hollow was available. Unlike settlement patterns in other parts of the nation in which people, schools, shops, and churches were concentrated at a particular focal point, the Appalachian pattern provided few centers where people could congregate. Thus, communities of any size were few and the distances between them were magnified by the difficulties involving transportation.

---

[10] President's Appalachian Regional Commission, Appalachia, p. 19.

[11] Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 12.

While the nineteenth century witnessed the rapid settlement and development of the rest of the nation and the eventual linkage of urban centers and even small towns by rail and road, Appalachia was largely bypassed by national transportation patterns. The resulting isolation has tended to reinforce the early pattern of rural settlement which was characterized by the dispersal of the population deep into hollows and across ridges in extremely small communities and mining camps which were virtually cut off from the economic growth and development of the larger American society. While trade, industry, and education developed across the nation during the nineteenth century, Appalachia stood still or declined.[12]

During the last few decades of the nineteenth century Appalachia's potential as a source of abundant natural resources was discovered. Now that the limited agricultural potential had been decimated here was an opportunity for Appalachia to develop a viable economy. Unfortunately the opportunity was lost. The President's Appalachian Regional Commission has pointed out that successful development in regions rich in natural resources has generally followed a particular pattern:

---

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

> a. Exploitation of natural resources produces wealth.
>
> b. That local wealth is invested in human and social capital . . . (the complex of housing, education, transportation, public and private services, community facilities such as hospitals, planning commissions, organizations and institutions).
>
> c. The investment in social overhead provides a platform for a kind of spiraling, self-generative development which is wholly independent of the natural resources that triggered the regional economy in the first place.
>
> d. The key to sustained progress is the continuing successful development of the human and social resources attracted to the region by the natural resources.[13]

Except in a few communities this process of development did not take place in Appalachia.

The great hardwood forests of the region were quickly cut during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when there was a heavy demand for railroad ties, mine props, and lumber for housing and furniture in the eastern part of the United States. However, most of the timber was owned by outside firms which had bought up thousands of acres very cheaply. The huge profits made by these corporations was rarely reinvested in the development of Appalachia, and the rapid denuding of the mountain slopes compounded the conservation problems created by the primitive agricultural practices of the region's farmers. Nor did the timber industry prove to be a permanent large-scale industry in the mountains, for there was no effort made to replant cleared tracts of land. Even when a second growth of timber did appear in some areas the demand for the region's lumber had begun to decline.[14]

---

[13] President's Appalachian Regional Commission, *Appalachia*, p. 19.

As coal became increasingly important to the nation's economy, Appalachia became the site of frenzied activities on the part of those who swarmed into the mountains to purchase mineral rights. The mountaineer knew virtually nothing about the value of coal or the intricate and exploitive contracts he was asked to sign. They were offered what seemed to them to be a sizeable sum of money, and many signed away their land or at least the right to the minerals beneath the land for a very small price.[15]

Like many other regions which became economically dependent upon coal mining, Appalachia suffered whether the industry was thriving or not. During the boom periods, particularly during the two world wars, the miners enjoyed high wages and regular work, but mine disasters, pollution, pitched battles between the unions and operators, the growing dependence on a single industry, and the gray life in company towns still blighted the region and its people.

---

[14] Caudill, pp. 61-69.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 72-75.

The 1950's witnessed the development of several events which indicated the folly of reliance upon a single industry. The diesel replaced the steam engine and long-distance pipelines for oil and natural gas were built across the nation. The demand for coal dropped, and the industry began to rely upon automation in order that it might compete with cheaper fuels. By the early part of the 1960's machines had displaced nearly two-thirds of the men in the mines of Appalachia. There were few jobs available for the displaced miners, commercial farming was an impossibility in most areas, public services declined as the tax base shrank, and shops and stores began to close for their former customers had no money. Thus began the great migration from the region, the advent of widespread welfare dependency, and a cycle of poverty that remains unbroken in many parts of Appalachia.[16]

The unfortunate legacy of almost total reliance on coal would have been softened considerably if a sizeable proportion of the wealth created by the industry had been reinvested over the years in the development of other economic activities, an educational system that prepared children for something other than existence within an isolated mountain society, and a transportation system that would open the mountains to the outside world. Instead most of the wealth created by coal as well as timber was invested elsewhere:

---

[16] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 15-23.

> It went down stream with the great hardwood logs; it rode out on the rails with the coal cars; it was mailed between distant cities as royalty checks from nonresident operators to holding companies who had bought the land for 50 cents or a dollar an acre. Even the wages of local miners returned to faraway stockholders via company houses and company stores.[17]

Although mining can no longer support the economy of the region, it continues to pose serious ecological problems. Most of these problems were simply ignored as long as coal was king. Unsightly slate dumps not only mar the countryside, but they emit strong fumes which kill all surrounding vegetation, acid leaks from the mines and fouls the streams, and strip mines scar the land contributing to more erosion and pollution.

Thus, the history of Appalachia reveals a pattern of development characterized by isolation, neglect, exploitation, deprivation, missed opportunities, and sins of both commission and omission. Within the confines of geographical, social, and economic separateness, the mountain people generated a subculture whose uniqueness increased with time as did its incompatibility with both nature and the society beyond the mountains. When the larger society began to penetrate the mountains in search of its mineral wealth the

---

[17] President's Appalachian Regional Commission, Appalachia, p. 20.

Appalachian was not only unprepared to take advantage of the economic opportunities which were available, but he was likewise unable to prevent the rape of his land. Nor has socialization within the traditional subculture prepared many contemporary Appalachians to respond effectively to the problems deriving from the actions of his forebearers.

The Importance of Isolation

While reference has been made throughout this study to the fact that isolation has played a major role in the development of the Appalachian region, it is of such importance to an understanding of the cultural tradition of rural Appalachia that it seems worthwhile to enlarge on that role. As was mentioned in discussing the settlement of the region, the isolation of Appalachia motivated many of the original settlers to make their homes in the mountains. However, after the middle of the nineteenth century few people came into the region, and the population grew largely as a result of natural increase rather than migration. As a consequence the culture that developed was based almost completely upon the traditions which were brought into the region during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[18] The continued lack of transportation routes into and out of the mountains also contributed to the maintenance of a closed society and thus the perpetuation of pre-Civil War cultural traditions.

---

[18] Pearsall, p. 36.

Under these circumstances ways of doing things remained the same in the mountains generation after generation, and the culture that developed simply did not provide any principles for adapting to changing conditions. The interrelatedness of the cultural tradition and the economic malaise which developed in isolated Appalachian communities as a result of this inability to change is illustrated by the following statement by Pearsall:

> Ways that were only temporary expedients on other frontiers here became folkways. Repeated generation after generation in the absence of alternative ways, they have become guiding principles, sacred in themselves and not to be questioned. Thus tradition defines as right and proper customs by which it is manifestly impossible to make a living at the present time.[19]

Modern methods of transportation and above all communication have now brought most rural Appalachians into contact with the outside world. However, it is necessary to recognize that this is a relatively recent occurrence, and that there are still mountain communities which do not really maintain more than a minimum amount of social and cultural intercourse with the larger society. Nor does the presence of transportation and communication facilities necessarily mean that they have altered in a significant way the thoughts and actions of the rural Appalachian in terms of movement toward a modern life style. An example of the continuation of a considerable amount of isolation in rural Appalachia is provided by a study of 324 families in the mountains of eastern Kentucky. Over half of these families lived on a dirt road that was often impassable by car, or on no road at all. Only 40 per cent owned a car or truck. Forty per cent of the men and over half of the women go to town no more than once a month, while over 50 per cent of both sexes reported that they had not been to a large city within the past year.[20] The lack of communication with the outside world is further indicated by the following figures:

---

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

> Over four-fifths of the families had no member who read a newspaper regularly, half of the families seldom or never saw television, and a third had no radio. The few who read newspapers mostly read local county weeklies. Use of bookmobile and libraries was confined almost entirely to school children.[21]

Thus, while isolation is diminishing it is still a prominent factor in some rural areas. Historically it explains much in terms of the development of the cultural tradition of the region and it has also played a major role in the economic decline of the region and the inability or unwillingness of many of the people to deal effectively with the problems which necessitate change and adaptation if they are to be solved.

---

[20] Johnson *et al*., pp. 67-86.

[21] *Ibid*., p. 86.

Rural Appalachian Values and Attitudes

While the foregoing discussion provides a general description of the impact of isolation on both the past and present development of Appalachia, an awareness of the role played by isolation in the development and perpetuation of regional values and attitudes is necessary to a full appreciation of its importance. Specific treatment of isolation will not necessarily be made in this section of the study, but it should be kept in mind that those values and attitudes being discussed are products of cultural isolation to a very large extent.

Individualism

Throughout much of the history of the United States a great deal of emphasis has been placed on the desirability of personal independence and self-reliance. Perhaps, no other society has placed these traits so high among the hierarchy of values to which all good citizens are expected to subscribe. The extent to which these traits continue to be honored or practiced, and the degree of importance which they hold in an interdependent society such as modern America, can easily be debated. However, it is difficult to deny their historical importance in the political, social, and economic ideology of the United States, and it is virtually impossible to understand or appreciate the life style of rural Appalachia without recognizing the continued importance of these traits.

While personal independence and self-reliance may have played a positive role in mountain life in the past, the maintenance of these characteristics has contributed to the problems which currently plague the region by inhibiting the success of change efforts which require a cooperative endeavor. This fact was noted even by two of the earliest chroniclers of life in Appalachia. Campbell pointed out that such traits were a definite hinderance to the cooperative efforts demanded by life in the modern age,[22] and Kephart observed that while the staunch individualism of the Appalachian was a source of strength and charm, it nevertheless contributed heavily to his weakness as a citizen.[23] Contemporary observers of the region such as Weller contend that these traits continue to this day to add to the problems of the mountain people.[24]

In addition to the absence of cooperative efforts in Appalachia, another negative aspect of the independent attitude of the people can be seen in the degeneration of independence into a type of excessive and self-centered individualism among many Appalachians. Weller maintains that independent and self-reliant people are often quite admirable, particularly those who value a certain amount of autonomy in their thought and action but who at the same time work toward the common good. However, he decrys the excessive individualism of many Appalachians by pointing out that it is often self-directed and thus more closely related to selfishness than independence:

---

[22] John C. Campbell, The Southern Highlander and His Homeland (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1921), p. 93.

[23] Horace Kephart, Our Southern Highlanders (New York: Outing Publishing Co., 1913), p. 309.

[24] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 29-33.

> . . . a man works, perhaps in independent ways, with his own gain or well-being in mind. It is to this quality of individualism that the mountaineer's independence has come. All that he does has the self and its concerns at heart. He is self-centeredly independent, so that even if he does join a group (a union, a PTA, or even a church) his intention, however unconscious, is that the organization shall serve his own personal interests and needs. If it does not, even though it may be serving a worthwhile goal, he will not continue in the group. He does not conceive of the "public good" except as it coincides with his own "private good."[25]

It would, perhaps, be unwise to accept Weller's assertions without some reservations in view of the fact that his is an original hypothesis concerning the situation and that there is at least one study which cautions against equating a personality attribute such as selfishness with a cultural doctrine such as individualism.[26] However, it would seem equally foolish to completely disregard Weller's insights particularly when they do provide a plausible explanation for the rather puzzling actions of many rural

---

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[26] Stephenson, p. 103.

Appalachians. Studies by Ford, Pearsall, and Stephenson also lend a certain amount of credence to Weller's position by commenting on the failure of the Appalachian individualism and self-reliance to prevent the widespread acceptance of a state of welfare dependency in the region.[27] Not only did an overwhelming percentage of the people in Ford's survey agree that welfare was a good thing, 32 per cent did not feel that it made people less self-reliant.[28] Other types of federal aid programs received their strongest support in the rural parts of Appalachia where traditional values such as independence and self-reliance are supposedly the strongest.[29] According to Weller, "This bears out the fact that a good many mountaineers do not value self-reliance as firmly as might be supposed. It is their trait of individualism which is served."[30] Ford also notes that a majority of Appalachians favored cooperative programs as long as they do not have to be supported by local taxes.[31] Weller commented on this by pointing out, "Here again the mountaineer's individualism comes to the fore. He does not see government as 'we,' a cooperative extension of himself, but only as a 'they.'"[32]

---

[27] Ford, pp. 13-14; Pearsall, p. 57; Stephenson, pp. 102-103.

[28] Ford, pp. 13-14.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[30] Weller, *Yesterday's People*, p. 32.

[31] Ford, p. 15.

Given the topography of Appalachia and the type of people who settled the region, it is not surprising that fierce independence and self-reliance were characteristic of the original population. Continued isolation helped perpetuate these attitudes and as they were maintained over the years they may well have degenerated into what Weller describes as excessive, self-directed individualism. Even though the individualism of the rural Appalachian is no doubt declining as Ford contends and Weller admits,[33] it continues to pose a significant problem for those who are attempting to promote regional development.

Traditionalism and Fatalism

While traditionalism and fatalism do not accompany one another in many isolated rural societies, there is a definite relationship between them in rural Appalachia. It is, of course, not particularly surprising that traditionalism is strong in the region when one considers the long period of social and cultural isolation. It does not seem necessary to belabor the point, for the impact of traditionalism becomes increasingly obvious as various aspects of Appalachian society are described. However, the fatalism which has such a pervasive influence in Appalachia is deserving of more attention because it attends and supports the traditionalism of the region to such an extent that developmental change cannot be successfully initiated so long as it persists to such a marked degree.

---

[32] Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 33.

[33] Ford, p. 34 and Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 32.

Fatalism was probably not a common characteristic of the people of Appalachia during the period of settlement. Instead it developed as a result of the frustrations engendered by years of struggling unsuccessfully with an environment that refused to yield to man's desires. The hope of the early settlers was eventually replaced by a sense of resignation and the growth of a philosophy based on the premise that external forces rather than man controls human destiny.[34] Ultimately this philosophy came to serve the rural Appalachian as a means of rationalizing away his failure and as a buffer against disappointment. Moreover, it also led to the passive acceptance of unnecessary hardships by encouraging people to feel that their life style was in no way to blame for their plight, and, therefore, there was no need to change. While such views may seem ridiculous in the larger society with its emphasis on progress and success, Pearsall has observed that, "It should be remembered that to a considerable degree, this is a realistic view for the poor and uneducated who are quite literally not masters of their own fate."[35] She is no doubt correct, but it does not alter the fact that when efforts are made to assist in the process of change and to help the rural Appalachian to become the master of his own destiny, the fatalistic philosophy of the region serves to frustrate such efforts.

---

[34] Ford, p. 16.

Fatalism is also closely related to the religious attitudes of many mountain people. Ford notes that the other-worldly emphasis of religion in rural Appalachia shares the same premises as fatalism and arose from the same circumstances.[36] The belief that life is controlled by external forces, whether it be nature or the God who directs nature, and that man must simply accept his lot in this life in hopes of reaping rewards in the next is common among Appalachians. The natural corollary of this idea is, of course, that to try to determine or guide one's destiny would be a sacrilege. Thus, fatalism has become an integral part of the fundamentalist doctrine of the mountain religion.

Ford's study of the current prevalence of traditionalism and fatalism in Appalachia has convinced him that these traits have weakened to a considerable degree in recent years.[37] However, questions can be raised concerning the reliability of at least part of the survey data. Ford's contention that traditionalism is no longer as strong as it once was is based in part on responses to a question designed to measure parental aspirations for their children in terms of amounts of schooling. The survey shows that there is a widespread desire among Appalachian parents for their children to be well educated.[38] However, whether such a response is truly indicative of a lessening of traditionalism is certainly open to conjecture, particularly in light of Nelsen's study which points out that the educational attitudes vocalized by rural Appalachians are not at all consistent with their actions in regard to the education of their children.[39]

---

[35] Marion Pearsall, "Communicating with the Educationally Deprived," Mountain Life and Work XLII (Spring, 1966), 9-10.

[36] Ford, p. 16.

Ford's survey also included a question which asked Appalachians to indicate what they felt was the most important factor involved in being successful in one's work. The question was intended to serve as a means of measuring the extent of fatalism among Appalachians. However, the response to this question does not offer much of significance in terms of supporting Ford's contention that fatalism has weakened considerably. Several other questions also elicited a rather high percentage of fatalistic responses particularly among rural residents.[40]

---

[37] Ibid., p. 16.

[38] Ibid., p. 17.

[39] Chapter III, p. 98.

While Ford is probably correct in noting that traditionalism and fatalism are declining in Appalachia, this writer contends that they are still quite prevalent in the rural areas. Because of the continued existence of such cultural traits, efforts to stimulate change in the region will be hindered.

Supernaturalism

Another characteristic of the isolated rural areas of Appalachia is the reliance of many people upon superstition and myth to explain natural phenomena. In her study of a mountain community, Pearsall observed the relationship between the fatalistic religious attitudes of the region and supernatural beliefs:

> Many aspects of life that have long since been taken over by science and a variety of secular specialists in most of American society are interpreted here as the unalterable ways of God. Natural and supernatural are not neatly and permanently separated, and natural phenomena are never entirely outside the realm of supernatural explanation.
>
> Even where knowledge of natural phenomena is empirical, there is a feeling that much of nature is mysterious and beyond the power of man to predict or control.[41]

---

[40] Ford, pp. 17-21.

[41] Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 106.

Matthews' study of an Appalachian community in Tennessee revealed that many of the people believed in witches and ghosts as well as individuals and groups which supposedly possessed supernatural powers. She also points out that such beliefs are indicative of the internal strains within the community. The people accused of having supernatural powers are the acquisitive, those who dare to violate local norms, and the social misfits. Tensions within the community are relieved to a certain extent by making these people supernatural scapegoats.[42]

Death beliefs are still evident in rural Appalachia, and at times they are practiced if there is a ritual which can be performed against death.[43] In some Appalachian communities sudden or violent deaths are always attributed to supernatural as well as natural causes; "God's will" or "the wrath of God" or some other reference to the supernatural often provide the final explanation for tragedy.[44]

While reliance on superstition, myth, and magic may at times play a positive role in some communities as Matthews suggests, it also serves to complicate the task of displacing fatalism and encouraging faith in man's capacity to master his environment and thus his destiny. In addition, these beliefs combined with the reliance on folk medicine hamper efforts to overcome the health problems of the region.

---

[42] Matthews, pp. 103-107.

[43] Lynwood Montell, "Death Beliefs from the Kentucky Foothills," Kentucky Folklore Record XII (July/September, 1966), 81-86.

[44] Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, pp. 111-120.

Time Perspective

Like other aspects of mountain life, the time perspective of the rural Appalachian differs considerably from that of the larger society. The majority of Americans seek success and accomplishment, and their lives are largely oriented toward the future. Such a life style naturally includes adherence to concepts such as delayed gratification and careful planning for the future. However, within the rural Appalachian subculture there is an absence of any major concern for the future except in terms of the hereafter.[45] Despite the traditionalism which pervades the region, the rural Appalachian does not appear to be much more oriented toward the past than he is toward the future:

> Tradition is an unconscious rather than a conscious guide. Rather, life is lived primarily in terms of the present which is also the past and future telescoped into immediate experience. There is neither much learning from the wisdom of past generations nor much planning for the future. There is little incentive to put up with irksome restrictions and effort-demanding actions either for the sake of a nebulous future goal or in order

---

[45] Stephenson, pp. 94-96; Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 81; Gladden, pp. 65-67.

to bring honor to one's ancestors.[46]

The present-orientation of the rural Appalachian is reflected in the constant emphasis on the gratification of immediate needs. Such an attitude is no doubt a common characteristic among people who live at a subsistence level as do many of the people in rural Appalachia. "Putting aside meager resources for a rainy day makes no sense if it rains every day."[47] Therefore, one finds many mountain people living from day to day without planning ahead or attempting to alter the course of their destiny. They see the present as being extremely pressing and the future as too nebulous to merit serious consideration, particularly when "today is like yesterday and tomorrow will be like today."[48] The time perspective of the rural Appalachian is obviously related to and supportive of the general sense of fatalism which characterizes the region, and it, therefore, represents another aspect of the cultural tradition which serves to hinder change efforts.

It is also important to an understanding of the Appalachian life style to note some other aspects of the mountaineer's conception of man's relationship to time. While the concept of time as a device to regulate various aspects of daily life is beginning to accompany the other modern trends which are making inroads into rural Appalachia it still does not influence the rhythm of regional life to the extent that it does in the larger society. Several studies of mountain communities indicate that calendars and clocks are not assigned a great deal of importance.[49] Instead, day and night, the seasons, and family activities regulate the rhythm of mountain life. Pearsall notes that time "is not something to be wasted or saved or cut into arbitrary units to which all events must conform."[50] It is not difficult to imagine the problems the rural Appalachian might have in adjusting to the regular hours demanded by an industrial society after growing up in a non-machine society where one has traditionally determined for himself when he would work and when he would rest.

---

[46] Pearsall, Mountain Life and Work XLII (Spring, 1966), 10.

[47] Gladden, p. 65.

[48] Gazaway, p. 61.

The importance of person-to-person relationships in the mountains also serves to strengthen the disregard for tight schedules and carefully regulated activities. Weller's description of this aspect of the mountain culture indicates the influence it exerts on the rhythm of regional life:

> He cares far more about keeping a friendly relationship with a neighbor whom he has met on the way to a meeting than about being there on

---

[49] Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 81; Stephenson, p. 95; Gazaway, p. 61.

[50] Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 81.

> time. . . . In the middle class world, a man can impersonally do what business needs to be done with a person, then proceed elsewhere. In the folk culture, you don't just stop in for a moment to check on a detail or two of business, then move on. Each contact is a person-to-person encounter, and this takes time--hours of it. A trip to the store, going to the neighbors' to borrow a cup of sugar or an ax, meeting a friend on the road--these are not impersonal encounters, in which the business at hand can be done quickly; but they are occasions for the kinds of personal relationships that form the very core of the mountain man's existence.[51]

Attitude Toward Work

The attitude toward work which is held by many rural Appalachians stems from two ideas which clearly reflect the traditional subculture. First, unlike most Americans, rural Appalachians define themselves in terms of who they are rather than what they are. The major goal of life involves being rather than doing, and respect and status are assigned to a person on the basis of his family rather than the career or job with which he is associated. Thus, it is ascribed status rather than achieved status which prevails in the mountains.[52] Secondly, work is not seen as being enjoyable or fulfilling, it is simply a necessity. This attitude is not particularly surprising given the type of work that has traditionally been available in rural Appalachia. However, because of this attitude toward work, few rural Appalachians seek any type of vocational training or entrance into a vocation which others view as a satisfying one.[53]

---

[51] Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 55.

[52] Pearsall, Mountain Life and Work LXII (Spring, 1966), 11.

In contrast to the middle class American who complies with the Protestant ethic and devotes a considerable amount of time and energy to his work, the rural Appalachian simply rejects the idea that a job should come before other considerations such as family, friends, or even leisure. The importance of the family and person-to-person relationships in the Appalachian subculture, plus the time perspective, the individualism, and the quality of jobs available in the region have worked in combination to influence many mountain people to believe that one should work only to live rather than live for one's job. Consequently, it is not uncommon for migrants from Appalachia to frequently take a few days off from their jobs in the city to return to the mountains for reasons that would seem inexcusable to most Americans.[54]

Interpersonal Relationships

Having described several of the values and attitudes which are major characteristics of the traditional life style of rural Appalachia, it seems appropriate at this point to turn to some observations concerning the nature of interpersonal relationships in the region. The nature of these relationships is basic to an understanding of the thoughts and actions of the rural Appalachian and, thus, the discussion which follows should contribute to a more complete comprehension of the values and attitudes previously described. It should also be noted that the most important interpersonal relationships in rural Appalachia take place within the family which will be treated in a separate section. Therefore, the emphasis in the following discussion will be on the general nature of interpersonal relationships rather than the parties involved.

---

[53] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 102-107.

[54] Ibid.

Contemporary American society is often described as being extremely impersonal despite its increasing interdependence. Rural Appalachian society, on the other hand, represents the other extreme, for it is characterized by very close and intense interpersonal relationships. Given the rurality and the small population of the region, less impersonalism would naturally be expected. However, there is a difference in the nature of interpersonal relationships in rural Appalachia which set them apart from those which can be observed in other rural areas. The difference lies, perhaps, in the degree to which such relationships tend to dominate the thought and actions of the rural Appalachian. While this aspect of mountain life has been explored and commented on to some extent by other scholars,[55] it seems to the writer that Weller has offered the most helpful observations. Utilizing concepts drawn from the work of Herbert Gans, Weller has described the rural Appalachian as being person-oriented in contrast to the majority of Americans who are object-oriented. While he is careful to point out that these two concepts represent poles of behavior between which individuals operate rather than precise categories into which all people can easily be placed, it is obvious that those rural Appalachians whose life style reflects the traditional subculture consistently remain close to only one pole of behavior--person orientation.[56]

Gans emphasized that the poles of behavior are best understood by focusing on the differences in the aspirations of the people who are found in the two categories. Object-oriented individuals aspire to achieve goals which center around particular objects, "This may be a moral object, for example, a principle; an ideological object, such as 'understanding'; a material object, such as a level of income; a cultural object, such as a style of life; or a social object, such as a career or a status position."[57]

---

[55] See, for example, Stephenson, pp. 99-106 and Pearsall, Mountain Life and Work LXII (Spring, 1966), 11.

[56] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 49-50.

[57] Herbert J. Gans, The Urban Villagers (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962), p. 90.

Naturally, the children of object-oriented people grow up in an environment which emphasizes the idea that one sets goals and then strives to achieve them.

The person-oriented individual is no less interested in striving, but he aspires to achieve a different type of goal. Rather than being primarily concerned with objects, "the overriding aspiration is the desire to be liked and noticed by members of a group whom one likes and notices in turn."[58] Once this type of person finds acceptance within a particular reference group he develops a very intense dependence upon it. Since all his important aspirations are developed in reference to the group, they cannot be achieved outside of it; thus, he cannot bear to be separated from it. This is not to say that object-oriented individuals do not participate in groups, but as Gans points out they do so in order to accomplish an object goal.[59] Should they join a group, they do not become dependent upon it, and if it should become an obstacle to their goals they will leave it and seek another. The distinctions between the relationship of the person-oriented and object-oriented individual to the group is further clarified by Weller:

> While the object-oriented individual will either join or leave a group in order to achieve his goal, the person-oriented individual can find what he is seeking only within the group. For the

---

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 90.

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91.

> object-oriented individual, ideas are central--something "out there," beyond the person himself. For the person-oriented individual, social relationships are central--something within and very personal, a security of acceptance, which can be found only within the group.[60]

Weller also contends that the differences in orientation described above result primarily from the type of social and economic situation which prevails in a given area. Where opportunities for the achievement of object goals are present, people will probably tend to be object-oriented. However, in rural Appalachia and other regions where such opportunities are limited, people are forced to find fulfillment in social relationships.[61]

The rural Appalachian who is a person-oriented individual operates almost completely within the confines of his reference group. The influence of this group is so pervasive that its activities literally constitute the social life of many mountain people. At the same time it provides the only source of emotional security and identity available to thousands of rural Appalachians. It is this reference group which largely determines the personality of the Appalachian and, thus, the subculture of the region.

The adult reference group is generally composed primarily of family members. In addition to the nuclear family, members of the extended family such as cousins, uncles, and brothers are included as well as a few close neighbors. However, such groups include only persons of the same sex and status. Husbands and wives in rural Appalachia, unlike their middle class counterparts, do not share many activities because they belong to different reference groups. While the reference group is not entirely a closed entity, its composition changes very slowly. As migration and death deplete its numbers new members may be added.[62]

---

[60] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 50-51.

[61] Ibid., p. 51.

Throughout the rural Appalachian's life his reference group dominates his thoughts and actions, shapes his view of reality, and defines his place in mountain society. It is only within the group which is his center of being that he is able to develop his self image. While all men are dependent upon others for their concept of self, such dependence is generally distributed throughout a number of groups. However, the mountaineer relies entirely upon the reference group in this respect and, thus, "has never developed a satisfactory self-image as an individual. He is only somebody in relation to his peers."[63]

Whether Weller is completely correct in his application of Gans' conceptual scheme to rural Appalachia could no doubt be debated. However, the behavior of many people in the region does tend to be more understandable when viewed from this perspective. In addition, the concept of person-orientation offers not only a plausible means of explaining the prevalence of the close and intense interpersonal relationships in the region, but it also illustrates another aspect of mountain life, besides religion, which serves to help offset the social and economic problems which otherwise would make life in rural Appalachia almost unbearable.

---

[62] *Ibid*., p. 68.

[63] *Ibid*., p. 83.

However, despite the positive effects such an orientation might have, it is necessary to recognize that the nature of the interpersonal relationships in the region is an integral part of the cycle of poverty which will have to be broken if change is to take place. While the person-orientation of the rural Appalachian derives at least in part, from the fact that it is extremely difficult for him to achieve object goals due to economic conditions, it also represents a part of the Appalachian life style which demands modification to some extent if the region is to overcome its problems.

A number of attitudes common to rural Appalachia stem from the tendency to be person-oriented, as do a number of problems. For example, the time perspective of many mountain people, their attitudes toward work, the absence of object goals, and the lack of planning for the future are related to their person-orientation. The heavy dependence upon a particular group results in the development of behavior which makes it almost impossible for the mountaineer to change his life style without at the same time rejecting the norms of his reference group. This naturally creates enormous barriers against change. Because the rural Appalachian relies entirely on the reference group as a source of ideas and values, he is not easily reached or influenced by people beyond his group. This not only contributes to the maintenance of a closed society, but it also complicates efforts to promote a spirit of cooperation among different reference groups within the community. Ideas, beliefs, and values are internalized by members of the group to such an extent that new ideas from outside the group or disagreements with outsiders are taken personally rather than in the spirit of intellectual give and take that prevails elsewhere. This supersensitivity to criticism or any hint of criticism in the guise of an opposing idea derives from the person-orientation of the rural Appalachian who equates the rejection of his ideas or beliefs with personal rejection.[64] Thus, it is difficult for the mountaineer to settle grievances with another individual or an agency because every disputed issue involves a deep personal commitment, cooperative activity among different reference groups is hindered, effective leadership does not develop, outsiders remain objects of suspicion, new ideas are rejected, and change does not take place. Moreover, the Appalachian children are brought up among adult models who rarely display object-oriented behavior but instead expend their time and energy in an attempt to maintain and improve their relationships among family and friends. The children cannot help adopting similar attitudes. Thus, they are trained for failure in school and in the society which lies beyond the mountains. Nor will they be capable of helping to bring about the changes so badly needed in the region.

---

[64] *Ibid*., p. 53.

The Rural Appalachian Family

The foregoing discussion of the values and attitudes which characterize regional thought provides an introduction to the Appalachian cultural tradition, but the treatment of that tradition would be woefully incomplete without a description of the role of the rural Appalachian family. Indeed, the family is so significant to an understanding of rural Appalachia that it is necessary to devote a considerable amount of attention to the important role it has played in the development of the regional subculture.

Characteristics of the Family

Rural Appalachia is to a large extent a familistic society in which family and kin are valued above and beyond all other institutions.[65] The extended family (composed of uncles, aunts, cousins, and grandparents in addition to parents and children) rather than the nuclear family is basic to the social structure of rural Appalachia. Members of the extended family often live in a cluster within a hollow or valley,[66] and it is these extensive kinship units which have traditionally provided both the most meaningful source of interpersonal relationships and the most important mechanisms of social control in the region. While the extended family system is now beginning to show considerable signs of strain as a result of the gradual intrusion of modernism and change into the region,[67] it still remains the major source of meaningful relationships and personal security, particularly in the rural areas.

The majority of families in rural Appalachia retain some of their traditional patriarchal flavor, although it would no longer be correct to consider Appalachia a patriarchal society.[68] Within the home the father is the source of authority and he makes the major decisions. Although this too is beginning to change primarily as a result of the economic malaise which has contributed to the destruction of the image of the male as the breadwinner, it still remains the common approach to family life.

---

[65] Schwartzweller and Brown, Social Structure of the Contact Situation, p. 2.

[66] Brown and Schwartzweller point out that the clustering of families is rapidly declining as a result of limited economic opportunities which have prompted migration from the region. James S. Brown and Harry K. Schwartzweller, "The Appalachian Family," Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs, ed. John Phodiatis and Harry K. Schwartzweller (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), p. 89.

[67] See Schwartzweller, "Social Change and the Individual in Rural Appalachia," pp. 59-61 for a description of the strains experienced by the Appalachian family as a result of the intrusion of change into the region.

There is also a rather sharp definition of sex roles in the mountain culture. Certain tasks and responsibilities belong only to women, while others are only for men. Housework and taking care of the children are seldom, if ever, done by the male. Until recent years few women worked outside the home, but as the hard and dangerous work which once dominated the mountain economy has declined and increasing numbers of men became unemployed, women began to seek employment out of necessity. However, the percentage of Appalachian women in the work force remains lower than the national average.[69]

The family in rural Appalachia is also characterized by the variety of useful functions it serves. Because of the tendency for members of many extended families to live close to one another, visiting among family members is quite frequent. The frequency of visitation is also increased by virtue of the fact that the all-important reference group of the rural Appalachian is composed primarily of members of the extended family. Given the proximity of residence and the importance of relationships within the reference group, it is not surprising that the family becomes the major line of communication for the individual members. It is within the family that group opinion and norms are molded and enforced, and it is here that decisions are made concerning matters of importance to the family. Some economic activities such as farming are still carried out in a cooperative manner, and in times of crisis the family depends largely on one another.[70] To the mountain child born and reared among members of the family and, perhaps, a few close neighbors, it is the family group which represents security. The family becomes the most important point of orientation for the child and it remains so throughout his life. Relatives provide a form of cultural security, and they tend to reinforce and sanction the individual's behavior.[71] As Gazaway points out, it is the family which "prescribes how members will react toward people, things, or institutions."[72] Thus, the kinship network is heavily relied upon by the rural Appalachian as child and adult, for the satisfaction of both essential and secondary needs, and for the most part he experiences little active engagement with the larger society unless this happens through the kin network.[73]

---

[68] Brown and Schwartzweller, "The Appalachian Family," p. 87.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 88.

---

[70] For an excellent discussion of the traditional family system in rural Appalachia see James S. Brown, The Family Group in a Kentucky Mountain Farming Community (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station, 1952), and James S. Brown, "The Conjugal Family and the Extended Family Group," American Sociological Review XVII (June, 1952), 297-306.

[71] Stephen R. Cain, Community Action in Appalachia Unit III: A Selective Description of a Knox County Mountain Neighborhood (Washington: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1968), pp. 46-47.

The tendency to interact almost exclusively within the family rather than with a variety of individuals and groups derives not only from tradition and the nature of socialization in rural Appalachia, but also from the fact that the small population of most rural communities in the region seriously limits the number of available marriage partners. The ultimate result of the static population and the propensity to marry into a local family is a very complex kinship system.[74] The complexity of the system is illustrated in the following description of relationship patterns in three eastern Kentucky communities:

---

[72] Gazaway, p. 94.

[73] Schwartzweller and Brown, Social Structure of the Contact Situation, p. 2.

[74] Brown and Schwartzweller, "The Appalachian Family," pp. 88-89. The authors point out the fact that the Appalachian family is so close-knit results in considerable pressure being placed on the individual to choose a mate whom kinsfolk will accept. This is one reason why mates are often chosen from among local people who are well known to the family.

> It was found that of the total number of possible single, closest blood relationships among the thirty-eight Beech Creek families, nearly three-fourths were kin relationships in some degree. . . . 18.8 per cent of the total possible relationships were "close kin". . . . An additional 24.0 per cent were relationships of first cousins once removed, or second cousins. Comparable data for the Laurel neighborhood revealed that there too nearly three-fourths of the total possible relationships were kin relationships in some degree; nearly half of the total relationships . . . were those of . . . close kin . . . ; and an additional 13.2 per cent were relationships of first cousins once removed, or of second cousins. In Flat Rock neighborhood also, nearly half of the total relationships were those of parents and children, siblings, aunts or uncles and nieces and nephews, grandparents and grandchildren, or first cousins.[75]

This reflects the clustering of families mentioned before, and, of course, indicates one reason why many rural Appalachians rarely have contact with people outside the kinship group and thus become very dependent upon the family.

Child Rearing Practices

The child rearing practices which are common to rural Appalachia differ in important respects from those which are utilized in the larger society. They reflect the influence of familism and also contribute to the perpetuation of the kinship orientation of the region.

There are two very distinct stages of childhood in the rural Appalachian subculture, and they are characterized by the different treatment which is accorded the child as he moves from one stage into the other. The period of infancy is marked by a very indulgent and overprotective attitude toward the child on the part of the parents and other members of the extended family. The infant is constantly fondled and made over and is seldom punished or prohibited from doing as he pleases. Rather than being trained to conform to a schedule, children at this stage of development are permitted to eat, sleep, and rise when they desire to do so.[76]

---

[75] Brown, American Sociological Review XVII (June, 1952), 299.

However, after a relatively long period of babyhood, Appalachian children suddenly find themselves on their own. The period of extended childhood and adolescence common to middle class society is simply not recognized in the mountain culture, and once the period of infancy is over no clearcut distinction is drawn between children and adults. No stringent rules and regulations are imposed, and parents tend to be rather permissive with children of this age. One also finds that no goals are set for the child in terms of his future.[77]

While rural Appalachian parents are often permissive, punishment of children does occur quite often. However, it is directed at keeping children in line rather than at moving them toward some desired goal such as completing an assigned task. For example, children are often told to do some minor task around the home but frequently nothing is done if the command is not obeyed.[78] On the other hand Pearsall found that whippings often occur when fathers become angry about something which may or may not be related to the child.[79] Thus, the rationale underlying disciplinary action does not reflect a child-centered approach to training or a concern for the development of goal-oriented behavior.

---

[76] Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, pp. 100-101.

[77] *Ibid*., pp. 100-102 and Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 64-68.

According to Weller the change in attitude toward children after they pass the stage of infancy can be partially explained by the fact that families in rural Appalachia tend to be adult-centered rather than child-centered as are most middle class families. In contrast to Appalachian families, middle class parents plan and sacrifice for their children, push them toward a variety of goals, and often center their lives around the hopes they have for their children. The adult-centered Appalachian family, however, concentrates its efforts on meeting the needs and desires of its older members. Children are simply expected to become adults as soon as possible, and very little conscious effort is expended in helping bring this about.[80]

---

[78] Gladden, pp. 148-59 and Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 64-68.

[79] Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 101.

The Appalachian youth, having been pushed into the background after a long period of attention during infancy, ultimately finds himself in need of a reference group. Adult reference groups and the adult-centered home offer him little in the way of meaningful relationships, so he eventually becomes part of a reference group composed of adolescent youths. Such groups receive very little guidance or attention from concerned adults, and like the reference groups of mountain adults they often have a negative influence on their members in terms of the apathy and the state of dependency they generate:

> The boys plan and carry out contests of strength and physical prowess, teach one another about sex . . . and generally exert a very conservative influence on each other. For example, any boy in the group who does well in school, or who studies hard, or who sets goals for his life which he tells the group about, becomes the object of ridicule; he either succumbs to the pressure or else is dropped from the group altogether. . . . It is nothing short of tragedy that these reference groups can exert such pressure on the individual boy without being countered by any adult influence. The youth's life is so involved with these groups, his security is so bound up with them, that few are strong enough to go their own way outside them. Adults do not know and seem hardly to care what goes on in these groups, so long as there is no community trouble resulting from the boys'

---

[80] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 63-64. Brown and Schwartzweller, "The Appalachian Family," p. 88 also contend that the average American family is much more child-centered than is the Appalachian family.

> activities. Adolescent society, in short, is very much unguided by experienced adults. Boys teach boys and girls teach girls. It is no wonder that mountain culture tends to perpetuate itself in traditional ways.[81]

Disadvantages

In Chapter II of this study it was pointed out that the small-scale individual was characterized by a considerable amount of dependency on a limited number of people. He interacts with a small group, and these interpersonal relationships involve an intense commitment to group norms and attitudes. This, of course, results in a very restricted and provincial view of reality due to the rather complete dependence upon such a limited source of ideas and values. It also hinders the individual's ability to respond effectively to the challenges of a changing environment in the mountains or to adapt to the demands of life in the larger society should he migrate.

The foregoing description of the rural Appalachian family suggests the extent to which it contributes to the development of a small-scale society which is incompatible with the realities of life in the twentieth century. However, familism has played such a decisive role in molding contemporary Appalachian society that a more specific enumeration of its disadvantages seems worthwhile.

The excessive amount of dependency upon the family and the kinship network has led to a variety of problems both for the individuals within rural Appalachia and for the region as a whole. For example, Gladden contends that familism is a key factor in the inability of some rural Appalachians to respond effectively to the economic problems which face the region. This stems from the fact that the predominance of the kinship group and like-minded neighbors in the lives of many Appalachians has created such a sense of emotional dependence that they find it impossible to leave their reference group even when their economic support system is no longer viable. Of those who do move elsewhere, many cannot adapt to new surroundings and return to the security of the reference group.[82]

---

[81] Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 69.

Ford has also commented on the involvement of the Appalachian family in the cycle of poverty which afflicts the region. He notes that the Appalachian family system has often failed to socialize the young in relevant patterns of behavior which will enable them to successfully seek a higher standard of living. At the same time, however, the system has succeeded in socializing the children in such a way as to make them very dependent upon the family which represents their only real source of security. The unfortunate result of this combination of factors can be seen in the continued inability of many rural Appalachian families to supply the basic needs of its members, which in turn leads to a growing sense of insecurity; "and the more insecure they become, the more they turn to their traditional source of security--the family itself."[83] Thus, the cycle repeats itself, and those who continue to seek security within the family will no doubt find it exceedingly difficult to escape the limitations it places upon their ability to acquire a decent standard of living.

---

[82] Gladden, pp. 117-19.

Brown and Schwartzweller have likewise criticized the excesses of familism in rural Appalachia by pointing out that the localism which seriously hampers change efforts in the region derives primarily from the family's monopolization of the individual's allegiance:

> In some instances, family loyalty is so strong as to be almost pathological by modern middle class standards. Loyalty to specific persons, even nonkin, is often very great, but loyalty to groups beyond the kinship unit is generally regarded as something to be avoided by most mountain people. It is difficult for programs of change to create community feeling or spirit, to say nothing of devotion to multicounty units or development areas.[84]

They also note that the kinship system has traditionally performed many of the functions in rural Appalachia that formal organizations are responsible for elsewhere.[85] Thus, formal organizations are practically non-existent in the rural areas of the region, and as changing conditions have created the necessity for organized groups the family system has hindered their development.

---

[83] Thomas R. Ford, "Comments," Poverty: New Interdisciplinary Perspectives, ed. Thomas Weaver and Alvin Magid (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1969), p. 131.

[84] Brown and Schwartzweller, "The Appalachian Family," p. 90.

In addition to the disadvantages which the family system has imposed on the region as a whole, it is necessary to recognize that familism also has certain negative effects on individuals. Despite the intense loyalty and the close relationships which are common to the Appalachian family, it often lacks the sense of togetherness and affection one might expect to find in such a situation. Few activities are participated in by the entire family, and, as was previously mentioned, adult reference groups are divided along sexual lines. Therefore, many husbands and wives seem to have no common interests, and the children rarely share in the activities of either their mother or father. The rural Appalachian family is held together to a very large extent by the need for emotional support. Little is given by the individual member of the family to strengthen and support the group; rather he is a part of the family because he must draw his strength and support from it.[86]

---

[85] Ibid.

[86] Jack E. Weller, A Profile of the Appalachian Family (Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1968), p. 8.

Gladden, in his study of eastern Kentucky families, points out that there is a definite lack of warmth and affection toward adolescent children despite the fact that the actions of parents encourage their offspring to become overly dependent upon the family.[87] Cain also notes that the relationship between mature children and their parents did not appear to be affectionate or close in the Appalachian families he observed.[88] Ball has likewise commented on this phenomenon of Appalachian family life:

> The literature on Appalachian life consistently points to an intensive emotional dependence on kin. Some young people simply never establish themselves as separate individuals. Nor are they encouraged to do so by their parents. Both children and parents maintain what might be termed a "clinging behavior" which may be based less upon genuine affection and shared activities than upon neurotic emotional entanglements characterized by mutual resentment. Grown offspring who hate their parents cannot bear to be away from them. Migrants who have finally broken away suddenly and curiously return home at the slightest misfortunes. The subculture not only condones this behavior, but it functions to institutionalize it.[89]

Dr. David Looff, a psychiatrist at the University of Kentucky, contends that the strong sense of dependency on the family has generated psychological difficulties among many rural Appalachians, particularly children.[90] Ford agrees that such problems could easily develop in those families which are held together by obligation rather than affection. Family members have obligations to their kin whether they feel any affection toward them or not, and the mental and emotional strain which develops in a situation where affection is absent quite possibly explains the lack of intrafamily communication which is often found in Appalachian families.[91] Weller also notes that feelings and emotions are often bottled up and stifled due to the desire to maintain harmony in the family. Controversy is often pushed into the background and disagreements quickly covered up or smoothed over. Thus, mental and emotional strain increases, and the rural Appalachian never really learns to deal with controversy, conflicting ideas, or disagreements.[92] Brown and Schwartzweller feel that this aspect of Appalachian family relations also has a negative effect on the tenor of life throughout the entire community:

---

[87] Gladden, pp. 153-54.

[88] Cain, p. 51.

[89] Richard A. Ball, "A Poverty Case: The Analgesic Subculture of the Southern Appalachians," American Sociological Review XXXIII (December, 1968), 892.

> We can also attribute the everlasting bickering, malicious gossip, and quarreling which are commonly observed in many mountain neighborhoods to, in part, the clannish nature of Appalachian families. Individuals have been taught to refrain from expressing feelings of hostility within their conjugal or extended

---

[90] Looff, pp. 120-27.

[91] Ford, "Comments," p. 130.

[92] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 79-80.

> family groups; to do so would be to violate familistic norms. Hostile feelings are consequently repressed, often to emerge with unusual and unwarranted intensity toward persons outside the family. The hot-temperedness of mountain people . . . is, we believe, closely linked with the nature of the Appalachian family.[93]

The traditional family system of Appalachia is, of course, continually perpetuated by virtue of the fact that the family monopolizes the early socialization of children. Because the Appalachian family is so close, it is more of a primary group in terms of bringing up children than in the middle class. Since mountain families are generally quite traditionalistic, their monopolization of the socialization process proves to be unfortunate because the children are almost bound to reflect the worst as well as the best aspects of the traditional subculture.[94]

The dependency of the child on the family and his commitment to the traditional way of life is also encouraged by Appalachian child-rearing practices and the constant inculcation of the time-honored beliefs related to family obligations. The lack of parental or adult guidance accorded adolescent children naturally results in the child being forced to choose his own models to emulate. Many children have only a limited choice, and quite often they emulate members of the family or close neighbors who exhibit the lack of goal or object-oriented behavior which is so common among adults in rural Appalachia. Thus, the mountain child is rarely challenged or motivated to go beyond the accomplishments of his parents and kin:

---

[93] Brown and Schwartzweller, "The Appalachian Family," p. 91.

[94] Weller, A Profile of the Appalachian Family, pp. 9-10.

> In growing up, neither sex receives any of the driving goals and ambitions to follow careers that so beset middle class American children in towns and cities. Their horizon is bounded by family and neighborhood. The future does not call for planning. By the time they reach school age they have already accepted continuation of the family with its cultural forms as a fact of existence. Early social maturity is thus a factor in the later rejection of ideas from other cultural systems.[95]

As the Appalachian child grows up surrounded almost entirely by members of the family and a few neighbors he finds little opportunity to interact with others. In fact, much of the socialization process teaches him not to interact or cooperate with others.[96] This attitude, combined with the extreme personalism which characterizes mountain life, makes it very difficult for rural Appalachians, both children and adults, to evaluate people on the basis of what they can do rather than who they are.[97] This attitude presents another problem to be overcome by those who are concerned with regional development, for it is rather obvious that in our rapidly changing society development and modernization require cooperation and trust among a larger group than the family and a few friends.

---

[95] Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 103.

[96] Ibid., pp. 99-100.

[97] Brown and Schwartzweller, "The Appalachian Family," p. 91.

In addition to the disadvantages noted above, familism also creates problems for those who have chosen to leave the region. In fact, the limitations imposed by familism are often more obvious among certain of the Appalachian migrants than among those who remain behind. The larger society is making more and more inroads into the mountains, and the resulting changes are placing an increasing amount of stress and strain on the traditional family system. However, this represents a much more gradual process of accommodation to the forces of modernism than that which is demanded of the migrant. When the rural Appalachian migrates into the larger society the pressures of modernism on the traditional family structure are not only more immediate and severe but quite often they quickly accentuate the inutility of familism in urban America.

Part of the stress experienced by many migrant families results from the natural tendency of an industrial society to hasten the demise of the extended family. Eric Wolfe has noted that this is a rather common occurrence among groups which are making the transition from an agricultural to an industrial society:

> We may say that we are likely to find nuclear families where the division of labor is

> accentuated in society, but not in the family, while extended families are consistent with an accentuated division of labor within the family, but not in society.[98]

However, the strain on the family structure of many of the rural Appalachian migrants goes beyond the expected shift from an extended to a nuclear family. Much of the stress experienced by migrant families is related to the fact that many aspects of their life style which are directly related to their familistic orientation are simply not functional in the larger society. The dependency engendered within the Appalachian family makes leaving the mountains and familiar people difficult to begin with, and it also contributes heavily to the difficulty many migrants have in adjusting to life in the city. Culture conflict rather than adaptation and assimilation is often the result. While the difficulties of the migrant cannot be blamed entirely on the familistic orientation of the Appalachian subculture, they are definitely related. The host of problems encountered by the migrant will be elaborated upon in another part of this chapter. However, it seemed appropriate at this point to comment briefly on the disadvantages which the migrant faces as a result of his socialization within the traditional family system of rural Appalachia.

---

[98] Stephenson, p. 76.

The Rural Appalachian Community and Its Institutions

Before describing the rural Appalachian community and the major institutions of the region, emphasis must be placed on the fact that the use of the term community in reference to rural Appalachia requires at least two qualifications. First, and foremost, it is necessary to recognize that many Appalachians see the community as nothing more than a group of people living in close proximity. They do not associate community with the concept of a group of people, external to the family, who share common ties and interests and who interact cooperatively to achieve these interests. Rural Appalachians who are part of the traditional kinship system find that most of their needs are met by the family. Therefore, the community is utilized only to satisfy those needs and desires which extend beyond the capacity of the family.[99]

Secondly, it should be noted that there are distinctly different types of communities in rural Appalachia. There are numerous hollows inhabited by one or several families which are often quite isolated from the outside world. There may or may not be a road of sorts coming into the area; many times a dry creek bed serves as the only road. The people living in such remote areas interact regularly with very few people beyond family members and nearby neighbors. Since the local church probably provides the only group activity close to the hollow, the family does not participate in what is generally considered community life.[100]

---

[99] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 87-88.

Most hollows are served by a larger rural community which is not too far distant. These communities vary in size from those which are composed of a few houses and a general store which also serves as a post office and gasoline station to the larger settlements which have several stores, a school, and two or more churches. While such communities are far less remote geographically than are most of the hollows, many of them are still rather isolated.[101]

In addition to the communities mentioned above there are small towns scattered about the rural areas which are likely to be county seats. While the resident population is generally small, such towns often serve as regional commercial centers and, therefore, have a variety of stores and shops, a small police force, some professional people, a volunteer fire department, and several churches.[102]

There are also a number of coal mining towns or

---

[100] Ibid., pp. 88-89.

[101] Ibid., pp. 89-90.

[102] Ibid., pp. 91-92.

"camps" throughout the mountains. A few are still relatively prosperous, but most have either been abandoned or they have deteriorated considerably since the days when coal was king. Virtually everything from homes to schools, churches, public services, medical clinics, and stores were once owned by the coal companies. The company town fastened a new sense of dependency on the residents which did much to prevent the development of an attitude of community responsibility.[103]

Problems of Participation, Leadership, and Agency Utilization

Given the obvious limitations in the developmental potential of most of the types of communities described above, organized and cooperative action on the part of residents and local institutions is an absolute necessity if successful change efforts are to be initiated and maintained. Yet, as has been mentioned many rural Appalachians have no real sense of community, and, therefore, are not apt to participate in or cooperate with programs designed to bring about change within the community. Such programs are often resisted or at best ignored. Attempts to improve sanitation, educational, health, and transportation facilities have often collapsed because of citizen apathy.

It would be inaccurate to say that there are no people in the rural areas who are concerned with cooperative efforts in behalf of community change, for as Ford and Schwartzweller have pointed out group processes within rural communities are slowly developing.[104] However, Ford has also noted that the problem of disinterest on the part of the citizenry is still serious:

---

[103] *Ibid.*, pp. 92-94.

> One of the most obvious deficiencies . . . is the lack of a strong sense of social responsibility. In large measure this deficiency is a logical consequence of the traditional social organization of Appalachian society based on familism and the cultivation of individualism as a value. There has been a growing acceptance of the necessity of interdependence for the functioning of an industrial economy and urban society, but it has been viewed as little more than a necessity. There has been little concession that such interdependence entails any greater obligation to or responsibility for one's fellow citizens than what is absolutely necessary to maintain a specific activity. The bonds of loyalty to group or community are often so tenuous as to appear lacking altogether.[105]

The negative attitude of many rural Appalachians toward community involvement plus their traditional reluctance to join any type of formal organization other than a church has resulted in a lack of civic and fraternal groups. Therefore, the communities of the region are deprived of the service functions which such organizations typically render. This is not to say that civic and fraternal organizations do not exist in rural Appalachia, for they can be found in the small towns of the region. However, they do not receive a great deal of support, particularly from those members of the community whose life style reflects the traditional subculture. As Ford has pointed out part of the difficulty involved in the problem of promoting participation in organized activities stems from the lack of social skills among members of the community.[106] Gladden also noted this deficiency in his study of rural Appalachians in eastern Kentucky:

---

[104] Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," pp. 33-34, and Schwartzweller, "Social Change and the Individual in Rural Appalachia," p. 60.

[105] Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," p. 33.

> Adults are child-like in their comprehension of and competence in effective conduct in secondary groups. Living so completely in relatively unorganized primary groups, the mere thought of engaging in a systematic fashion in policy-making procedures with their peers creates panic if not revulsion. Part of this attitude of recoil from engagement is their ideological interpretation of the impossibility of planning for the future, let alone managing or pushing plans to fruition. It is certainly to be expected that resident participation in community organization will not be early or quickly achieved in areas where social skills of the constituency are so woefully weak.[107]

In addition to the fact that there are few groups capable of providing community leadership in rural Appalachia, one also finds that the number of effective individual leaders is also limited.[108] Again this is not meant to imply a total lack of leadership, but in those areas where they are needed most there is a definite shortage. Weller attributes the lack of leadership to the rural Appalachian's person-orientation which leads him to be more concerned with harmonious interpersonal relationships than with attempting to direct a group toward a particular object goal. The mountaineer has generally perceived himself as a reference group participant rather than an individual capable of leading the group.[109] Stephenson partially supports Weller's contention by pointing out that the leadership problem in Shiloh derives from the value of harmonious personal relations in the traditional mountain culture which is reflected in the fact that, "no one wants to be in the position of telling others what to do."[110] Matthews found that the residents of the community she observed perceived leadership in a very negative manner. It is seen as a status-related factor, like education and ambition, all of which are subjected to extensive criticism in the community.[111]

---

[106] Ibid.

[107] Gladden, pp. 123-24.

---

[108] Zeller and Miller have also noted that many of the most powerful people in Appalachian communities, in other words those who are capable of exerting leadership, are often opponents of community action efforts. Frederick Zeller and Robert W. Miller, Problems of Community Action in Appalachia (Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1968), p. 10. Ford, however, found the majority of Appalachian leaders to be progressive and committed to regional development. Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," pp. 25-27.

[109] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 83-84.

[110] Stephenson, pp. 131-32.

Another problem common to many rural Appalachian communities involves the inability or unwillingness of the mountain people to utilize those community services which are available to them. This situation is not only discouraging for those who seek to provide such services, but it also contributes to the perpetuation of the negative attitude of the rural Appalachian toward the value of community support and involvement. The plight of both the individual and the community agency can be seen in the sense of apprehension and anxiety which is generated among those rural Appalachians who are forced by circumstance to utilize the services of some unfamiliar organization such as a medical clinic, welfare agency, or employment service.[112] In many cases the mountain people avoid such agencies despite their needs; at other times they force themselves to utilize available services if absolutely necessary, but their fear of the unfamiliar and their lack of sophistication in such matters often leads to a confirmation of their suspicion and fear as well as difficulties for the agency involved. An excellent example of the bewilderment of the rural Appalachian in search of assistance and the difficulties encountered by a typical service agency has been provided in an article by Mary Wright, a social case worker in Appalachia.[113] In an attempt to enroll one of her cases, Buddy Banks, in the Aid to Dependent Children program for unemployed fathers, the author transported the man to the welfare office at the county seat. Her account of the problems and frustration encountered by this rural Appalachian in an eight hour period indicate why many mountain people who are in need do not utilize available assistance agencies. Having arrived at the welfare office Buddy had no idea what to do until Miss Wright suggested that he ask the only employee of the agency who was in the room. After being told who to see he waited in line and was eventually called for an interview by one of the clerks:

---

[111] Matthews, pp. 74-78.

[112] Ford, "Comments," p. 131.

> . . . I could imagine Mr. Banks nodding his head to the question he didn't quite understand, because he wanted to make a good impression, and it would be a little while before the worker realized he hadn't understood, and so they would go back and try again, and then Mr. Banks would explain as best he could, but he would leave something out, and then the worker wouldn't understand, so that in all their heads were bent together for almost an hour and a half. It seemed a long time to take to discover Buddy Banks' need--a visit to his home would have revealed it in a very few minutes, but of course 12 miles out and 12 miles back takes time too, and

---

[113] Mary W. Wright, "Public Assistance in the Appalachian South," Journal of Marriage and the Family XXVI (November, 1964), 106-409.

> then there are all those eligibility rules to be checked out, lest somebody slip them a lie and the editorials start hollering, "Fraud! Fraud!"[114]

When Buddy emerged from the interview he told the author that he would have to return the following week because he needed his birth certificate. She suggested that he go to the Health Department and get a copy of his birth records so he could complete the process of application without delay. Buddy refused to go to the Health Department until after he had gone to the Court House, and he left the welfare office without further explanation. Suddenly Miss Wright realized that he needed to go to the restroom but was too sensitive to ask if there was one closer than the Court House which was three blocks away.

By ten to one Buddy and the author were back at the welfare office with the birth certificate. He soon began to doubt the wisdom of the whole affair and remarked that he felt he should go home and think about the ADC program before enrolling. Eventually he was persuaded to remain. Within the next three hours he stood in the wrong line for fifteen minutes, the right line for another fifteen minutes, sat in another line for over an hour, talked with a training counselor, returned to the welfare worker for another discussion, was sent to the unemployment counselor, and terminated his day with a final discussion with his welfare worker. By four o'clock he was a registered applicant and had been told that he should return in two weeks to see if he was eligible and if there were any training slots open at that time. Whether he returned or not is doubtful.

---

[114] *Ibid*., p. 407.

Institutional Weaknesses in Rural Appalachia

The acceleration of change in rural Appalachia has, as was mentioned, produced a considerable amount of strain on the traditional family system. One also finds that severe strains within the individual are becoming apparent. Alienation, apathy, resignation, and related manifestations of frustration are becoming increasingly common in the region.[115] Given the fact that the individual is so dependent upon the family and that the family itself is under a great deal of stress, this is not entirely surprising. Hopefully, the family and the individuals within rural Appalachia will be able to adjust to the changes which are taking place and the apparent tension and stress which now characterize the region will be reduced. While the process of adaptation and readjustment will no doubt occur over a period of time, it will probably not take place very rapidly or smoothly until Appalachian society succeeds in changing the archaic institutional structure of the region. Some change has been stimulated in educational, religious, and governmental institutions during the recent past, but it remains all too obvious that institutional responses and adjustments have not kept pace with the expectations or needs of the rural areas of the region. Most rural Appalachian institutions are not functional as they once were and, thus, they are "no longer able to counterbalance some of the more critical tensions and strains--particularly those which bear upon the individual's psychic world and personal stability."[116]

---

[115] John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller (eds.), *Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), p. 167.

The roles played by two rural Appalachian institutions, the school and the family, have been treated and their limitations discussed. Therefore, attention will be given at this point to two other major institutions in the region, local government and the church.

Local Government

Local government in rural Appalachia is inextricably tied up with political wheeling and dealing, and as a result many of them have traditionally operated in a manner that is less than admirable in terms of both honesty and efficiency:

> In general, political practices which would be considered violations of community mores in other areas, such as in the rural Midwest, are still common events in rural Appalachia. Nepotism, buying votes, appointing unqualified individuals to important positions or qualified friends to

---

[116] Ibid.

> unnecessary positions are still common in certain parts of Appalachia, although not as frequent as before.[117]

Photiadis contends that while mountain politics and government are still rather sordid, local government has improved considerably during the past few years and now has the potential to contribute to the development of Appalachia. However, he also recognizes that such potential as does exist is seriously blunted by the negative attitudes held toward local government by many rural Appalachians. This widespread negativism, combined with the traditional fatalism of the region and the dependence of large numbers of people on local government assistance thus encouraging the maintenance of political machines, all serve to limit the efficiency of local government as an agent of change.[118]

Weller feels that the inefficiency of local governments in the region as well as the mistrust of government officials can be explained by reference to the extreme individualism and the person-orientation of the rural Appalachian. These traits cause the mountain people to interpret government actions as representing nothing more than the personal desires of office holders; the requirements of the law or objectivity on the part of public officials mean little to the rural Appalachian when they are used as justification for governmental policy:

---

[117] John D. Photiadis, "The Economy and Attitudes Toward Government in Appalachia," Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs, ed. John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), p. 124.

[118] Ibid., pp. 122-26.

> The idea that government officials must follow rules of good business or good politics based not on personal morality but on concepts of order, efficiency, and fairness to all, is difficult for the mountaineer to understand. Administrative channels are considered "the run around." He does not really believe in representative government, for he does not sufficiently trust other people. His idea is that elected officials are subject to him, not that they possess a rightfully delegated authority. The mountaineer judges government as good or bad by the extent to which its policies serve him.[119]

Many local officials in the region contribute to the preservation of these attitudes by operating their offices in a person-oriented manner--just as their constituents expect them to. The result is poor government, sectionalism, and a lack of objective decision making.

Unfortunately there does not seem to be much reason to expect the attitudes of rural Appalachians toward government to change in the near future. A study conducted in eastern Kentucky concluded that unlike American youth elsewhere in the nation, Appalachian children do not view officials and institutions of government as being benevolent, worthy, competent or powerful. Moreover, the study points out that there is no indication that a process leading to the development of support for the political system is operating in Appalachia.[120]

---

[119] Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 115.

As a result of the variety of factors mentioned above conscientious and concerned local government officials of all types find it difficult to carry out their responsibilities. This is particularly true of those officials and agencies which are attempting to promote regional improvement through change. The trials and tribulations of health officials provides an excellent case in point.

The economic malaise of rural Appalachia is, of course, a major reason for the existence of widespread health problems, but such problems are intensified considerably as a result of many of the attitudes which characterize the thinking of the region's people. While it would be senseless to emphasize the fact that the rural Appalachian naturally desires good health, again we see an example of a situation wherein he does not recognize that it is necessary to modify certain aspects of his life style if he is to achieve his desire.

---

[120] Dean Jaros, Herbert Hirsch, and Frederic J. Fleron, Jr., "The Malevolent Leader: Political Socialization in an American Sub-Culture," The American Political Science Review LXII (June, 1968), 564-75. For an interesting contrast to the data on the political socialization of Appalachian children see Robert D. Hess and David Easton, "The Child's Changing Image of the President," Public Opinion Quarterly XVI (Winter, 1960), 632-42; Fred I. Greenstein, Children and Politics (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), pp. 27-54; Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Tourney, "The Development of Basic Attitudes Toward Government and Citizenship During the Elementary School Years: Part I (Cooperative Research Project No. 1078; University of Chicago, 1965), pp. 102-105; Dean Jaros, "Children's Orientations Toward the President: Some Additional Theoretical Consideration and Data," Journal of Politics XXIX (May, 1967), 368-87.

Human pathology figures for the Appalachian region are much higher than for the rest of the nation, and studies conducted in rural Appalachia indicate that regional statistics do not do justice to the appalling number of health problems which exist in the mountain areas.[121] The rate of infant mortality in Appalachia is twice as high as that of the nation as a whole, and deaths from infectious diseases are one-third higher than the national average. Tuberculosis is rather widespread in the region as are psychological problems, intestinal parasites, malnutrition, typhoid fever, heart disease, mental retardation, neurological defects, and dental problems.[122] Strauss reports that of the rural poor treated at the University of Kentucky medical center approximately nine out of ten suffer from multiple health problems.[123] The region is also seriously deficient in physicians, hospitals, and facilities for treating mental illness. The health problems of Appalachia are further complicated by the fact that many rural communities do not have safe water supplies or adequate sewage disposal systems. In addition, water and air pollution stemming from mining activities create serious environmental health hazards.[124]

---

[121] See, for example, Jesse W. Tapp, Rena Gazaway, and Kurt Deuschle, "Community Health in a Mountain Neighborhood," Archives of Environmental Health VIII (April, 1964), 510-17; Gazaway, The Longest Mile, pp. 81-85; Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, pp. 153-61; Johnson et al., pp. 47-66; Robert Strauss, "Poverty as an Obstacle to Health Progress in Our Rural Areas," American Journal of Public Health LV (November, 1965), 1772-779.

[122] Page and Huyck, pp. 159-61 and Hanson, p. 73.

[123] Strauss, American Journal of Public Health LV (November, 1965), 1776.

Given these conditions, it is obvious that regional health agencies have not been particularly effective. However, their failure can be attributed largely to several problems over which they have little control. Poverty and isolation prevent many people from seeking needed medical attention. Fatalism and apathy often delay or prevent the recognition of symptoms or resort to proper medical care. Religious beliefs and folk medicine continue to have more appeal to many mountain people than modern medicine. While the rural Appalachian may listen to a physician who has practiced in the area for years and who understands local attitudes, they have little confidence in unfamiliar doctors and hospitals. They fear the unknown and having to deal with strange people. "Such fears are associated with the anxiety provoked by waiting and, especially, with anxiety about the experiences of strangeness, loneliness, and difficulty in communicating with--being listened to by and understanding--the medical personnel."[125] Doctors and hospital staffs are not person-oriented and are, therefore, feared and distrusted by many rural Appalachians.

---

[124] Page and Huyck, pp. 159-62.

Preventive medicine is an unheard of concept in many parts of the region. Both Weller and Pearsall have noted how difficult it is to persuade parents to have their children innoculated against diseases which are rather common in the area such as polio and typhoid fever.[126] Pearsall also points out that little progress has been made in convincing rural residents that there is a definite relationship between wearing shoes and the prevention of intestinal parasites.[127] The lack of preventive dental care is equally widespread.

As can be seen by the examples provided above, government agencies, whether they be politically oriented or not, find it extremely difficult to bring about the degree of change which is necessary if the region is to attain a faster rate of development. The difficulty stems in part from the poverty and isolation which characterizes many rural areas, but more important are the traditional attitudes and values of the regional subculture which militate against success on the part of government officials and agencies concerned with developmental change. On the basis of the rather ineffective performance of local government to date, the writer is forced to agree with Schwartzweller and Brown that Appalachian political institutions are not very influential in bringing about sociocultural integration with the larger society.[128]

---

[125] Strauss, American Journal of Public Health LV (November, 1965), 1776.

[126] Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 119 and Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, pp. 158-60.

[127] Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 158.

The Rural Appalachian Church

With the exception of the family and cultural isolation, religion has probably had a greater influence on all aspects of life in rural Appalachia than any other factor. Ford states that because religious values "underlie so many attitudes and beliefs, they exert complex and frequently subtle influences on secular behavior which are not always apparent to outside observers or even to the people of the Region themselves."[129] Given the significance of religious values to an understanding of the rural Appalachian subculture, the role of the church as a regional institution is particularly important.

Unlike the settlers of New England, Pennsylvania, or Virginia, those who first came into Appalachia did not bring with them a homogenous religious heritage. Instead they were as diverse in their religious views as they were in terms of their cultural heritage and political attitudes. Lollards, Puritans, Separatists, Anabaptists, Presbyterians, and Huguenots were among the groups of nonconformist sectarians represented in the mountains during the period of settlement. Living in isolation, their existing tendencies toward localism and opposition to any kind of centralized authority, religious or otherwise, were strengthened.[130] Caudill has also pointed out that the formal, organized churches of the period were not prepared to bring their spiritual guidance to the rampaging frontier:

---

[128] Schwartzweller and Brown, Social Structure of the Contact Situation, p. 4.

[129] Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," pp. 21-23.

> The vicars, the parsons, the priests and the preachers would have recoiled from frontier conditions as fire withdraws from water, and the frontier was a hundred years old before any serious effort was made to give spiritual instruction to its sons and daughters. . . . Consequently the frontiersman, in the Blue Ridge and in his wanderings across the Cumberland Plateau, has passed from five to ten decades out of contact with the Christian Church in any organized form. The King James Bible was relatively new when his fathers reached the New World, and the borderer retained a fierce respect for it as the Word of God. But many cabins were without it, and few of the inhabitants could read it, so that its contents more often than not came down to the frontiersman in garbled snatches from the preceeding generation.[131]

The basic ideas which characterize the religion of the region are largely a product of the revivals which went on almost unceasingly throughout the nineteenth century. It was during this period that organized religion came to the mountains as the Baptists and Methodists, capitalizing on the spirit of revivalism, developed a stronghold in Appalachia. Despite their growing popularity, however, both groups were continually losing some of their members to the various sects which splintered off from the more popular religious movements.[132]

---

[130] Earl D. C. Brewer, "Religion and the Churches," The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962), p. 201.

[131] Caudill, p. 25.

The decline in popularity of the Presbyterian church as it penetrated deeper into the mountains, in contrast to the success of the Baptists and Methodists, can probably be attributed to the fact that doctrinal simplicity and democratic organization had such an appeal to the Appalachian. An additional factor involved the emphasis on free grace by the Baptists and Methodists rather than the gloomy Presbyterian doctrine of predestination.[133]

Given the continued isolation of rural Appalachia well into the twentieth century, it is little wonder that the religious attitudes which became a part of the cultural tradition of the region were quite often unrelated, except by coincidence, with the doctrines associated with organized religion. Many of the frontier preachers who were largely responsible for the growth of the first churches in the region were self-proclaimed bearers of salvation. Most were uneducated and many were illiterate. According to Caudill it was not uncommon to find preachers whose knowledge of the Bible was extremely limited:

---

[132] Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," p. 22.

[133] Ibid.

> Many preachers . . . knew nothing more of the Bible than the passage read to them by a schoolteacher on an occasional evening spent in the preacher's cabin. It is not surprising, then, that the Scriptures preached in these early churches were a garble of unrelated and misquoted snatches, or that the doctrines which emerged were sometimes bizarre.[134]

Although conditions in terms of church leadership and religious scholarship have improved to some extent, many rural churches continue to embrace doctrines which reflect the lack of religious knowledge so characteristic of the past.

While religion continues to play an important role in the lives of many rural Appalachians, the churches of the region have not fared particularly well. As has been pointed out, the mountain people are not inclined to join organized activities, nor do they care to participate in cooperative endeavors. Their extreme individualism militates against a disciplined type of religion. Therefore, while rural Appalachians see themselves as being religious they do not find it necessary to affiliate with a church or even attend one.[135] As a consequence of these factors one finds that while church membership is increasing in Appalachia it continues to lag behind the rest of the nation in this respect. Membership figures in Central Appalachia are particularly low;[136] the Cumberland Plateau probably contains the lowest percentage of affiliation in Christendom.[137]

---

[134] Caudill, p. 57.

[135] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 124-26.

Due to the lack of membership and the tendency of small sects to break off from larger religious groups there are a host of very small churches in the region which offer very few services. Among the upwardly mobile in rural Appalachia, the Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches are the most popular. However, some of these people prefer to attend established evangelical churches such as the several Churches of God, the Adventists, Churches of Christ, the Church of the Nazarene, the Assemblies of God, and various Pentecostal churches.[138] Those people who are rather stationary in the lower echelons of the social structure, in other words the group with which this study is primarily concerned, generally attend one of the many splinter groups if they attend at all:

---

[136] Brewer, p. 202.

[137] *Ibid*., and Caudill, p. 58.

[138] Nathan L. Gerrard, "Churches of the Stationary Poor in Southern Appalachia," *Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs*, ed. John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), pp. 100-101.

> They prefer to seek religious fellowship in their own unpainted one-room frame churches, in abandoned school houses, in barns, in crudely constructed tabernacles, in tents, or in each other's home. There are thousands of such churches in rural Southern Appalachia, and generally, they are to be found on secondary or tertiary roads where land values are very low.[139]

Religious leadership in rural Appalachia is, for the most part, extremely poor. Many ministers are "Sunday preachers" who work at another job during the week. In addition, it was found by Brewer that 90 per cent of the rural ministers in Southern Appalachia served more than one church. As would be expected many rural preachers are poorly educated and do little to offset this by reading or in-service training. Given the fact that most rural churches pay little, if anything, the information cited above is not surprising.[140]

The religious beliefs and attitudes common to rural Appalachia both reflect and contribute to the individualism, traditionalism, and fatalism which characterizes the region. The impact of individualism on the Appalachian church has been referred to, and it is easily observed in the creation of numerous splinter sects as well as the refusal of many people to participate in the activities of the church.

The traditionalism of Appalachia can also be seen in the very conservative approach to religion within typical rural churches. The beliefs which underlie this religious conservatism are for the most part consistent with what is generally termed fundamentalism. Fundamentalism has been defined by Ford as:

---

[139] _Ibid_., p. 103.

[140] Brewer, pp. 215-17.

> . . . a composite of beliefs that are often but not always associated. The core of fundamentalism is Biblicism, or belief in the inerrancy of the literally-interpreted Scriptures. Built around this core are various creedal tenets: the Virgin Birth, Christ's miracles, physical resurrection and others. There is also an ethical aspect of fundamentalism that is popularly referred to as "Puritan Morality". . . . What is generally connoted by this term is strong condemnation of such worldly vices (or pleasures) as drinking, dancing, gambling, swearing, playing cards, and using tobacco.[141]

While it would be extremely difficult to determine exactly how many Appalachians would fall into the fundamental category, studies by Brewer and by Ford and De Jong indicate that the incidence of religious conservatism in the region is quite high. This is particularly true in the rural areas as would be expected.[142] However, fundamentalism also remains the dominant religious orientation in the urban areas of the region as well.[143]

---

[141] Thomas R. Ford, "Status, Residence, and Fundamentalist Religious Beliefs in the Southern Appalachians," Social Forces XXXIX (October, 1960), 43.

[142] Brewer, pp. 205-209 and Gordon F. De Jong and Thomas R. Ford, "Religious Fundamentalism and Denominational Preference in the Southern Appalachian Region," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion V (October, 1965), 27-29.

[143] Ford, Social Forces XXXIX (October, 1960), 44-46.

The fatalism of the mountain people is reflected in the other-worldly emphasis of their religion, and as has been noted both the fatalism and the religious attitudes of Appalachia share the same premises and arose from the same circumstances. The fatalistic philosophy of Appalachia has led to a complete rejection of the social gospel by impressing upon the people the belief that there is no hope of changing the immutable social order. Therefore, all the efforts of the church are concentrated on saving individual souls. These attitudes are also strengthened by the rather widespread belief in the rapid approach of the second coming of Christ and the establishment of the millenium.[144] The passivity engendered by the combination of fatalism and the other-worldly emphasis of the church creates another serious obstacle to the promotion of regional development.

In addition to the religious individualism, fundamentalism, and other-worldliness which are the hallmark of rural Appalachian religious attitudes, the services of the various churches also share a number of common features. One element that tends to be very common is the emotionalism and spontaniety which characterize the services. Long "hellfire and damnation" sermons provoke hearty amens, wailing, and crying. Hymns are sung as loudly and fervently as possible, often to the accompaniment of guitars, tamborines, and loud foot-stamping and hand-clapping. Faith healing and speaking in tongues may also occur.[145]

---

[144] Gerrard, pp. 106-107.

Despite the rather standardized services which are found in most of these churches, some of them also have unique features. For example, serpent-handling is practiced in a few churches in both West Virginia and Kentucky.[146] Gerrard has also described other examples such as a church in West Virginia which practices a form of polygamy and another which believes in the immortality of the body as well as the soul.[147]

While the rural churches generally share a common theology which is simple and concrete, there is often considerable variation in details of dogma from church to church and even from individual to individual within the same church. Much of the variation and the disputes over doctrine stem from the same type of situation that existed when churches were first organized in Appalachia:

> Knowledge of the Bible is fragmentary, and passages are frequently cited out of context or in garbled

---

[145] See Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 127; Gazaway, The Longest Mile, pp. 119-123; Berton H. Kaplan, "The Structure of Adaptive Sentiments in a Lower Class Religious Group in Appalachia," Journal of Social Issues XXI (January, 1965), 134-135.

[146] Gerrard, p. 105. For an interesting study of this religious practice and the function it serves in the lives of its adherents see Nathan L. Gerrard, "The Serpent-Handling Religions of West Virginia," Trans-Action V (May, 1968), 22-28.

[147] *Ibid.*, pp. 104-105.

> form. Often there is no Bible in the church unless a member brings one, but this is not surprising since most members of the congregation, at least among the middle-aged and elderly, are functionally illiterate. Nevertheless, the members enjoy doctrinal disputes, and the older men in particular fancy themselves as Biblical authorities. The issues argued, however, seldom involve conflicting interpretations of the same Biblical passages, but are most likely to be a confrontation based upon apparently contradictory passages from different parts of the Bible. An outsider may sometimes get the impression that the cited "quotations" have been improvised in the heat of debate--chapter, verse and all. The arguments in the disputes, like the testimonies and sermon, resemble streams of consciousness rather than logical discourse.[148]

The churches of the type described above are not disappearing from the rural Appalachian scene to any great extent despite the gradual breakdown of isolation and the fact that many church members now have a higher standard of living than in the past. Gerrard suggests that the continued existence of these churches can probably be attributed to the fact that they serve to offset many of the social and psychological anxieties generated by the harshness of life in rural Appalachia. Status deprivation, feelings of guilt deriving from the rigidity of the fundamentalist conception of "sin," frequent illness, and the need for recreation characterize the lives of the membership of many rural churches, and their approach to religion tends to alleviate such problems.[149] On the basis of his study of a small sect in the Appalachian section of North Carolina, Kaplan contends that the rural church offers several adaptive retreat devices which probably serve to inhibit the continued social and psychological disintegration of its members.[150]

---

[148] Ibid., pp. 105-106.

[149] Ibid., pp. 108-110.

However, despite the fact that the rural church does serve to alleviate to some extent the anxieties and frustrations of mountain life, the religious sentiments of these groups obviously play an important role in maintaining the status quo in rural Appalachia. Weller, himself an ordained minister, contends that "the Church in Appalachia is, beyond doubt, the most reactionary force in the mountains."[151] Cleland agrees that the rural church cannot be counted upon for assistance by those who wish to bring change to the region.[152]

Opinions concerning the church in Appalachia such as those expressed by Weller and Cleland, are based on several considerations. As was mentioned, the traditional orientation of the rural church combined with its fatalism and other-worldliness contributes heavily to the perpetuation of the social and economic problems of the region. Problem-solving activity is obviously discouraged by a religion that ignores the plight of the living and emphasizes rewards in the hereafter. However, the acceptance of such beliefs is naturally encouraged by the subsistence-type existence led by many of the people and the fact that it is easier to turn one's back on problems than to solve them, particularly when such action is sanctioned by religious beliefs. Thus, the religious tenor of rural Appalachia is an integral part of the self-perpetuating cycle of poverty in the region.

---

[150] Kaplan, Journal of Social Issues XXI (January, 1965), 139-40.

[151] Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 126.

[152] C. L. Cleland, Church and Family in Modern Rural Appalachia (Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1967), p. 29.

The fact that the religious attitudes described above are taught to the children of church members further complicates efforts to stimulate developmental change through the improvement of the region's human resources. The inculcation of these beliefs and attitudes in children tends to discourage them from securing an education. Some Appalachian ministers and parents have openly opposed secular education on religious grounds, and while the effect of such opposition cannot be accurately determined one can assume that it has played a role in the development of the educational malaise of the region.[153]

Given the nature of religious sentiment and practice among many rural Appalachians, it seems reasonable to contend that like the political institutions the religious institutions of the region cannot be expected to serve as an effective link between rural Appalachia and the larger society. In fact, the rural church probably stands as one of the major barriers to such linkage, because of its tendency to reject many of the values and attitudes upon which an interdependent society is built.

---

[153] Stephenson, p. 184; Kaplan, Journal of Social Issues XXI (January, 1965), 130; Orin B. Graff, Appalachia's Educational Situation: Twelve Basic Propositions (Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1967), p. 9.

Summary

It is obvious that many of the communities of rural Appalachia are rather unique when contrasted with those of other parts of the nation. The values and attitudes of a bygone era, many of which are now dysfunctional, are reflected not only in the general lack of a sense of community and the failure to perceive the potential value of cooperative interaction within the community, but also in the local institutional structure which has failed to provide the type of service or leadership necessary to the social and economic development of the region. The school, government, and church, and most importantly the family, have tended to contribute to the maintenance of those aspects of the cultural tradition which are partially responsible for the malaise of the region, and with the exception of the school none of these local institutions appear to have much potential as change agents.

Relationships with the Outside World

The personal relationships of the rural Appalachian with the outside world are of two types. First, there are a variety of individuals and agencies operating within the region which are extralocal in origin and are, therefore, representatives of the larger society and its norms. Examples would include federal and state government officials, some business personnel, and professional people such as doctors, dentists, and lawyers. This is not to say that all the people in these positions are outsiders, but many are. Even those who have grown up in the region probably received their training in an urban center, perhaps, outside Appalachia, and very often they no longer share many of the local values to the extent that they once did.

Reference has previously been made to the problems encountered by several of these representatives of the larger society such as medical and educational personnel and those who work in some of the agencies which serve the region. It has also been noted how difficult it is for many rural Appalachians to deal effectively with any kind of impersonal and bureaucratic agency such as the welfare department. The point is that the personalism of the rural Appalachian and his reference group orientation result in his being very suspicious and wary of strangers, particularly those from outside the region. According to Weller professional people and many of the governmental agencies deal with their clients in an object-oriented manner and this prevents effective communication.[154] The barriers which stand between the rural Appalachians and the representatives of the larger society are also increased by the existence of a rather commonly held opinion that outsiders only come into the region to take advantage of the residents. Given the history of Appalachia such an attitude is quite understandable.

The second type of relationship with the outside world occurs when the rural Appalachian ventures into the larger society, or some members of his reference group do. Trips to urban centers are taken by some, especially if they have relatives in the city, and migrants from the region return frequently to visit with their family and friends. These contacts with the larger society combined with the influence of the mass media have naturally had some effect on the thoughts and action of the rural resident. However, as was noted before the degree of significant change in rural Appalachia produced by these contacts is rather minimal.[155] It is the experience of the migrant himself, therefore, that provides us with the most important example of the second type of contact with the outside world, for by observing the nature of his interaction within the larger society one acquires a better perception of the capacity of the rural Appalachian subculture to prepare its people to live in the interdependent society which exists beyond the mountains and which is gradually making inroads into the furthest recesses of the Appalachian region.

---

[154] Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 102.

[155] Chapter III, pp. 83-84.

Migration Statistics

The plight of Appalachia is revealed not only by the host of economic indicators relevant to the region, but also by the high incidence of out-migration. The population trends of the region during the past twenty years offer convincing evidence of the acute deficit of economic opportunities in Appalachia.

The availability of high-paying jobs during the Second World War drew many Appalachian families toward the cities of the Midwest, and migration received new impetus following the war when marginal farming began to disappear and the coal mines began to automate. Between 1950 and 1960 approximately 2,201,899 people, or 12.7 per cent of the region's population, left Appalachia. The decade of the 1960's witnessed a decline in out-migration, but the region still suffered a substantial loss of population. Preliminary 1970 census figures indicate that 1,451,368 people, or 8.2 per cent of the population, have left Appalachia since 1960.[156] While virtually all parts of Appalachia experienced a decline in population during the 1950's, the Central Appalachian subregion was the heaviest loser. This same subregion continued to sustain the heaviest losses during the past decade.[157]

Migratory Streams

Those who have given special attention to the heavy out-migration from Appalachia have noted that during the past twenty years rather definite migratory streams have developed. Migrants from eastern Kentucky, for example, tend to move into Midwestern cities, especially those of southwestern Ohio such as Cincinnati, Hamilton, and Dayton. Migrants from western West Virginia generally move to cities in central and northeastern Ohio such as Columbus, Akron, and Cleveland, while those from eastern West Virginia tend to settle in Pittsburgh, Washington, or cities in Maryland. Migrants from the parts of Appalachia south of West Virginia and Kentucky often move into Atlanta and Birmingham.[158]

---

[156] "Statistical Report," Appalachia IV (September, 1970), 33.

[157] Gordon F. De Jong, "Is Out-Migration from Appalachia Declining?", Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meeting (San Francisco, August 28-31, 1969).

[158] James S. Brown, "Population and Migration Changes in Appalachia," pp. 36-37.

These migratory patterns have been stable for almost two decades, and their persistence can be explained not only by distance and location factors but also by the form and function of the Appalachian family. The role of the family in relation to migratory streams has been described by Brown:

> In a sociological case study of Appalachian migration . . . it was found that family groups, or extended families, tended to form residential clusters in the areas of destination. Migrants prefer to join their kinfolk and friends who have moved out earlier and in this process of chain-migration, "little Kentucky" or "little West Virginia" enclaves are established in or near the large metropolitan centers outside the region. In other words, the Appalachian kinship structure has a built-in migration system whereby the "branch-families" help each other get established in the areas of destination and the "stem-family" in the mountain provides a haven of safety during periods of social and psychological crises. Hence, it is to the individual's advantage to follow a traditionalized pattern of migratory behavior.[159]

Implications of Migration

While the heavy migration from Appalachia has been to a very large extent a virtual necessity given the decline of the region's economy, it also represents a tragedy. It is tragic for those who find it necessary to leave but do not wish to, for those who do not succeed in raising their standard of living in the larger society, and for the region which has lost many of its most productive citizens. Many Appalachians do not desire to leave their homes and venture into the urban world, but circumstances often dictate such a move. Even if they succeed in attaining a higher standard of living, and many do not, their economic gains may be offset by the psychic loss resulting from their absence from family, friends, and a familiar way of life. The psychiatrist Robert Coles has observed that Appalachian migrants often "want to return home because they have strong ties to cousins, to neighbors, and to a host of relatives as well as to parents."[160] Further evidence of the strong psychic hold which the region has on its former citizens is indicated by the fact that over half of the male respondents in a study of migrants from West Virginia stated that they hoped to retire in their native state.[161] However, despite such feelings Appalachian residents as well as migrants from the region are generally aware of the increased economic opportunities offered by the larger society, and there is no longer the intense family pressure to stay in Appalachia.[162]

---

[159] Ibid., p. 38.

The problems migration poses for the future of the

---

[160] Robert Coles and Joseph Brenner, "American Youth in a Social Struggle (II): The Appalachian Volunteers," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry XXXVIII (January, 1968), 42.

[161] John D. Photiadis, West Virginians in their Own State and in Cleveland, Ohio (Morgantown: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1970), p. 11.

[162] Hansen, pp. 78-80.

Appalachian region are reflected in the fact that the young and the best educated make up the bulk of the out-migrants. More than half of the out-migrants during the years from 1940 to 1960 were between the ages of 18 and 34. Yet this age group made up only one-third of the Appalachian population. From 1950 to 1960 the region's population declined 3 per cent. However, it is the age distribution figures for this period that reveal the major problem which is developing. For example, figures from the 1960 census indicate that there were 25 per cent fewer persons 20 to 24 years old and 28 per cent fewer persons 25 to 29 years old in the region than in 1950. By contrast there were 20 per cent more persons 55 to 59 years old, 21 per cent more in the 60 to 64 age group, and 31 per cent more 65 and over than there had been a decade earlier.[163] The combined results of out-migration and an increasing life span has created a serious situation in Appalachia:

> Because of the smaller proportion of persons of productive or working ages, say 25 to 64 years, in the Appalachian population as compared with the United States as a whole, the Appalachian people can be regarded as supporting considerably larger numbers of dependents. In 1960, in the United States as a whole there were 672 children and 200 older persons, a total of 872 dependents, for every one thousand working age adults, 25 to 64 years old. In the Appalachias, on the other hand, there were 735 children under 15 and 193 persons 65 and over,

---

[163] Brown, "Population and Migration Changes in Appalachia," pp. 38-39.

> a total of 928 dependents for every thousand adults. In Kentucky's Appalachian counties, there were 925 children under 15 and 208 older persons, a total of 1,133 dependents.[164]

Another negative implication of heavy out-migration relative to the future of Appalachian development can be seen in the impact it has had on both the quality and quantity of human resource potential in the region. Out-migrants are better educated than the Appalachian population as a whole; thus, the mass exodus of the past twenty years has served to lower the educational level of the region. It should also be noted that while the out-migrants as a group are better educated than their Appalachian counterparts, they have a lower educational level than the people in the areas of destination. Therefore, not only has migration had a negative effect on the educational level of the region, but it has had a similar effect in a number of cities outside Appalachia.[165]

Whether or not migration offers an acceptable solution to the economic plight of Appalachia and whether it should be encouraged or not are questions which can easily be debated.[166] However, the questions become rather academic in view of the fact that millions have already left the region, and there is little doubt that migration will continue, at least for the next few years, with or without encouragement. Given the purpose of this study there seems to be no need to pursue the matter. However, further elaboration on migration, particularly in terms of the process of adaptation and assimilation, is necessary for two major reasons. First, the experiences of many of the migrants in the city illuminate the limitations placed on rural Appalachians by certain aspects of their cultural tradition. Secondly, by noting these limitations one is provided with further data which should be relevant to the development of an educational system which is capable of serving the interests of both those Appalachians who migrate and those who will remain in the region.

---

[164] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[165] James S. Brown and George A. Hillery, Jr., "The Great Migration, 1940-60," *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*, ed. Thomas R. Ford (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962), pp. 68-69.

The Migrant and the City

The influx of large numbers of Appalachians into the urban centers of the nation has naturally attracted a considerable amount of attention and has resulted in the publication of numerous newspaper and magazine articles dealing with the subject. As a general rule most of these articles have emphasized the difficulties encountered by migrants, the "strange" life-style of the Appalachian, and the tendency to cluster in particular areas of the city. While such articles do serve to point out the most visible and obvious aspects of the migrant's encounter with the city, they often fail to treat the subject with the thoroughness necessary to a more complete understanding of the complex process of adjustment and assimilation.

---

[166] For a discussion of differing opinions on the subject of migration as a possible solution to the economic plight of Appalachia see Abraham S. Levine, "'Yesterday's People' and Tomorrow's Programs," Welfare in Review VII (July-August, 1969), 10-11; Dwayne E. Walls, "Appalachian migrants: How you gonna keep 'em down on the farm?", Appalachian Review III (Fall, 1968), 3-8; Hansen, pp. 77-80.

In an attempt to emphasize the fact that all Appalachian migrants should not be stereotyped as being incapable of adaptation to urban life, Huelsman has pointed out that there are three different life styles to be found among the migrant population in most cities and that each of these life styles consists of a different pattern of behavior and represents a different level of adaptation and assimilation. The port of entry life style is common to almost all Appalachian migrants who come to the city with very little money. The port of entry is always situated in a decaying section of the city where "slumlords" are willing to rent small, dilapidated apartments to recent arrivals. Many of the migrants come to a particular city because they have heard from a relative that jobs are available. Upon arriving in the city they go directly to the address of their kinsman, which is generally in the port of entry, and move in with him until employment is secured and a flat is rented. The background of many of the migrants leads them to want to live in the port of entry, at least for a while, because they will be surrounded by other Appalachians. Here they can frequent stores, bars, and churches which are filled with people from the hills.[167] In other words they have simply transplanted the Appalachian life style to the city and, therefore, they do not find it necessary, so long as they live in the port of entry, to modify that life style to any great extent. However, despite the sense of security that life in the port of entry provides the migrant, the conditions under which he lives in such an area may be worse than those he left behind.

The welfare-dependency life style is also common to many Appalachian migrants, particularly those living in public housing projects. Most of these families have lived in the city for a longer period of time than those living in the port of entry. Their accommodations are generally better than those which newly-arrived migrants are able to procure. However, these families have become dependent upon welfare support due to the inability of the father to secure employment. "Many a good old country boy from Eastern Kentucky has arrived in the port of entry in Dayton, Ohio only to find himself in Parkside Homes a couple of years later, the empty years stretching endlessly before him."[168] While such families have escaped the port of entry, their standard of living has not improved significantly, and even though their familiarity with the city and its ways has increased, their value structure does not seem to have been appreciably altered.

---

[167] Ben R. Huelsman, "Urban Anthropology and the Southern Mountaineer," Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science LXXVIII (1968), 99-100.

Then there are those migrants whose life styles could be termed assimilated. Many of them started out in the port of entry, found jobs, and eventually improved their skills and salaries. Now they are to be found in various parts of the city either renting or owning homes. The assimilated Appalachian has been drawn into the mainstream of American urban life. Although he retains his accent and, perhaps, his preference for Protestant fundamentalism and country music, he has shed those aspects of his Appalachian cultural tradition which might have prevented his assimilation in the larger society.[169]

Therefore, of the hundreds of thousands of Appalachians who have flocked to the nation's industrial cities, some have adjusted remarkably well to a new and trying environment and have been assimilated into the larger society.[170] However, it is probably reasonable to assume that many of those who do succeed in adapting to the city are middle class people whose background has prepared them in many ways to make a relatively smooth transition from life in Appalachia to life in a large city.[171]

---

[168] Ibid., p. 102.

[169] Ibid., p. 103.

Having noted the fact that a portion of the Appalachian migrant population does succeed in adjusting to the demands of life in the city, thus, belying attempts to stereotype all migrants from the region as failures and noncontributing members of urban society, the attention of this study will now focus entirely on that part of the migrant population which has considerable difficulty in adapting to life in the larger society. While one cannot state with any degree of certainty the percentage of

---

[170] It is, of course, necessary to recognize that there are different degrees of success in the process of adjustment. For example, some migrants may succeed in acquiring a good job but may not adjust socially or psychologically to life in the city and, therefore, be quite miserable. On the other hand, adjustment may take place on all levels of existence.

[171] Harry K. Schwartzweller and James S. Brown, "Social Class Origins, Rural-Urban Migration, and Economic Life Chances: A Case Study," Rural Sociology XXXII (March, 1967), 5-19 and Roscoe Griffin, "Appalachian Newcomers in Cincinnati," The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford (Lexington, Kentucky Press, 1962), pp. 79-84.

Appalachian migrants in the city which remain unassimilated,[172] the figures are probably quite high if the experience of Cincinnati is typical of other cities which receive large numbers of migrants. It has been estimated by a social service agency in Cincinnati that there are between 50,000 and 100,000 unassimilated Appalachians in that city alone.[173] In commenting on the situation an official of the agency points out:

> Many migrants do, of course, move relatively smoothly into a place in urban society. . . . those whose cultural attitudes are nearest assimilation and whose health, education and skill level make transition easier.
>
> The rest of the migrant population has become "ghettoized" to the point that the second or third-generation children have a worse lot than the original migrant population. The plight of these ghettoized Appalachians can be summarized in few short words: bad housing, unemployment or underemployment, poor health, alcoholism, juvenile delinquency, early school dropout, latent self-hatred due to lack of acceptance by society of their cultural identity.[174]

---

[172] The uncertainty stems not only from the obvious logistical difficulties which would be involved in a large-scale study of migrant assimilation, but also from the fact that assimilation theory is relatively unsophisticated. For a critical review of the state of knowledge about the process of assimilation see Lyle W. Shannon and Magdaline Shannon, "The Assimilation of Migrants to Cities," Social Science and the City: A Survey of Urban Research, ed. Leo F. Schnore (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968), pp. 49-75.

[173] James Branscome, "Appalachian Migrants and the Need for a National Policy," Appalachia IV (February, 1971), 4.

[174] Ibid., pp. 4-5.

The problems encountered by the Appalachian migrant are, of course, most obvious in the ghettos or ports of entry where the strong family ties of the migrants have led to a kind of voluntary segregation within "little Appalachia." Drawn to such sections of the city by the presence of kinfolk who migrated there before them, many Appalachians find it very difficult to ever escape from "little Kentucky" or "little West Virginia" due to their inability to secure a job which pays enough or lasts long enough to assure financial stability. There are also some migrants who succeed economically but prefer to remain in the port of entry for social and cultural reasons.

Perhaps, the largest of the "little Appalachias" is the section in Chicago known as Uptown. This 120 block area is populated by approximately 100,000 people, half of whom are migrants from Appalachia. The area is composed primarily of hundreds of rundown tenements, flophouse hotels, dirty restaurants, shabby bars, small business establishments, and many vacant storefronts, some of which have been taken over by a variety of Holiness churches. The country and western music so popular in the mountains pours forth from the numerous bars, and many of the stores cater to mountain tastes in food and clothing.[175] Like other "little Appalachias," Uptown reflects to a very large extent the socio-cultural image of an Appalachian community. However, the psychic comfort derived from these cultural islands is not sufficient to offset the deluge of problems with which the city confronts the migrant. In addition, the practice of clustering together slows the assimilation of the migrant into the larger society and serves to accentuate his inferior status.[176]

---

[175] Bill Montgomery, "The Uptown Story," Mountain Life and Work XLIV (September, 1968), 10-11.

Most of the migrants who leave Appalachia are fleeing the specter of endless poverty and want, but all too often they find that moving to the city does not solve their economic problems. Instead of economic stability, many migrants discover that they have simply fled from the exigencies of rural poverty only to become a part of the mass urban poor.

The Appalachian is also frustrated by the fact that his former dependence upon a person-to-person approach in dealing with others no longer works in the vast and impersonal city. The time-conscious, signed-paper, credential-oriented urban culture creates a sense of fear, distrust, and confusion among many migrants, for such attitudes are completely alien to their cultural tradition. Consequently, they find it difficult to function effectively in the city, to utilize the agencies which could be of service to them, or to avoid being taken advantage of by those who exploit their perplexity.

---

[176] Brown and Hillery, p. 68 and Shannon and Shannon, p. 65.

As was previously mentioned, community agencies are not widely utilized in Appalachia in dealing with personal problems. This traditional attitude plus the fact that the Appalachians are conditioned not to talk openly about problems of a personal nature results in the migrant being unwilling to take advantage of the urban social agencies which could do much to help him in terms of job training and employment, medical and dental assistance, family planning, housing, and legal services. Given these attitudes, it is easy to see why the nature of most agency-client relationships in the city tend to alienate the migrant:

> . . . such agency-client relationships may represent a wholly new experience, contrary in many ways to the highly personalistic relationships they have known. The client finds it hard to accept the fact that the agency's interest in him is limited to a specific service and that, to obtain this service, he must divulge information that he considers private. He may also find it difficult to accept the fact that, in successive contacts with the agency, he must deal with different staff members, each one requiring a new set of interpersonal adjustments.[177]

Several cities which have large Appalachian populations have established special agencies to assist the migrant.[178] One such agency is the Chicago Southern Center which is staffed by personnel who understand the Appalachian, his problems and his traditional aversion to bureaucratic agencies. The center is a nonprofit organization which provides food and clothing for destitute migrants, information concerning employment and housing, a variety of recreational and instructional programs, and counseling services. Despite the value such services could have for the migrant, the center is utilized by only a small minority of the Appalachians in Uptown. The consequences of their failure to take advantage of these services have been pointed out by the executive director of the center, James Grisham, "when a person doesn't come into contact with an agency such as ours within the first few days he is immediately two years behind in his adjustment."[179] Other agencies in Chicago such as the Uptown Maternal and Infant Welfare Station, the YMCA, and the Montrose Urban Progress Center are likewise ignored by most Appalachian migrants.[180] The story is much the same in other cities.

---

[177] Louis A. Fermen, "Manpower Adaptation: Problematic Social Conditions," Manpower Development in Appalachia: An Approach to Unemployment, ed. Frederick A. Zeller and Robert W. Miller (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968), p. 183.

In addition to their failure to utilize the social service agencies available to them, most Appalachian migrants do not participate in organizations such as unions, lodges, the PTA, community centers, and veterans groups. Such organizations have the potential to assist migrants in adjusting to urban living. However, even in those cities where such organizations do exist in "little Appalachia" they are largely ignored.[181] Just as in the mountains the church is about the only type of formal organization to which the migrants are attracted.

---

[178] Mary D. Daley, "The Not So Beverly Hillbillies," The Commonweal XCII (March 13, 1970), 5.

[179] Montgomery, Mountain Life and Work XLIV (September, 1968), p. 12.

[180] *Ibid*., pp. 16-17.

By refusing to utilize community agencies or participate in community organizations the migrant not only fails to secure much needed help, but the tragedy is compounded by the fact that the help he rejected might have prevented, or at least lessened, the possibility of exploitation at the hands of "slumlords," loan sharks, greedy merchants, and employment firms. For example, the lack of information concerning available housing results in many migrants paying excessive rent for extremely poor accommodations. By remaining in "little Appalachia," where apartments are generally available, they are at the mercy of landlords who know they are desperate for housing. Therefore, the migrant is forced to pay rent by the week in accordance with the unwritten law among tenement owners. Weekly rates protect the landlord from incurring a large loss if the migrant gives up and ships off quietly for home, while at the same time the rates average out to be more per month than the price for better housing in other parts of the city.[182] However, without help from an agency, the Appalachian is unlikely to either find better housing at a cheaper price, or to be accepted by the landlord if he should locate such housing.

---

[181] George Henderson, "Poor Southern Whites: A Neglected Urban Problem," Journal of Secondary Education XLI (March, 1966), 112 and Griffin, p. 84.

The migrant's lack of sophistication concerning life in the city is also exploited by a variety of stores in "little Appalachia" which encourage buying on credit. The lure of easy credit blinds many Appalachians to the high prices and excessive rates of interest he often pays for shoddy goods. Although better products could be purchased more cheaply elsewhere in the city, most migrants are not accustomed to comparison buying and they find it difficult to buy larger items from reputable firms because they are quite often seen as poor credit risks.[183]

One of the most harmful results of the migrant's naivete and his failure to utilize agencies capable of helping him find employment is the exploitation that occurs at the hands of the day work centers operating in most "little Appalachias." The typical method of operation of the day work centers in Uptown has been described as follows by a staff member of the Chicago Southern Center:

---

[182] Huelsman, Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science LXXVI (1968), 100-101.

[183] *Ibid*., p. 100.

> Here men from out of the hills go at 5 a.m. to find their first job "just to tide them over until something better comes along."
>
> At first look the pay doesn't look bad--$1.60 to $1.90 per hour. What many people don't know is that the employment firm takes a healthy bite of 60 to 80 cents an hour out of the pay as an employment fee. At the end of the day the men are handed a check--which can only be cashed at a nearby "currency exchange." There is, of course, a fee for cashing the check. To make life easier for the mountaineer, the currency exchange also sells money orders--for which there is a "slight additional charge."
>
> One employment firm has a colony set up from which the Appalachian day worker need never stray. Besides the employment office, transportation is provided to the jobs; a flop house is provided next door--again at a "reasonable" charge; and a bar is set up across the street as an inducement for the workers to "relax" when they come in from a hard day of work.[184]

If the migrant gets involved in the daily-pay cycle his chances of securing permanent employment in the near future are seriously reduced for several reasons. First, if he is working daily he has little time to search for a permanent job. The day work centers also require each employee to sign an agreement stating that he will not accept permanent employment in any job which the agency sends him for at least 90 days. Critics of the day work centers also insist that reliance upon these agencies eventually destroys the spirit and initiative of the migrant in search of permanent employment.[185]

---

[184] "Migrants Still Have Mountain Barriers," Appalachian Advance III (October, 1968), 12-13.

The time perspective and the attitude toward work which many migrants bring with them from Appalachia, and the fact that the work situation in the city differs vastly from that back home, add to the problems of adjustment experienced by the Appalachian. Many of the migrants were engaged in farming before coming to the city. While for some this was only a part-time endeavor, others earned their entire livelihood in this manner. Some also have experience in the mines or timber industry, and a few have worked in factories. However, for most of them work was primarily organized around the seasonal demands of subsistence farming. Even those who have worked at mining, lumbering, or some other non-agricultural job find the tempo of the urban situation to be attuned to specific timetables and more rapid than is true of work in Appalachia.[186]

The difficulties experienced by some rural Appalachians in adjusting to industrial jobs has been noted in a number of studies. Stephenson found that several men from Shiloh who had worked at industrial tasks complained about the rapid pace they were expected to maintain, working indoors, the noise level, monotony, and claustrophobia. They also expressed resentment about being supervised closely while on the job.[187] Pearsall also notes that the independence of the rural Appalachian leads to resentment of being given orders, "They are easily angered at real or fancied attacks on their freedom to come and go, work or not, as they please."[188] The same attitude toward supervision was found in an eastern Kentucky community by Gazaway.[189] Schwartzweller encountered similar attitudes in his study of Appalachian migrants employed in Ohio. One of the foremen who was in charge of a shift composed largely of migrants explained that, "they don't like to be bossed and they seem to be afraid or shy in front of the boss. Then, too, you have to ask them to do the work rather than tell them."[190] Schwartzweller also points out that the individualism and personalism of the Appalachian causes relationships with supervisors to become a major source of strain on the migrant.[191]

---

[185] Montgomery, Mountain Life and Work XLIV (September, 1968), 17-18.

[186] Harry K. Schwartzweller, Adaptation of Appalachian Migrants to the Industrial Work Situation (Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1969), pp. 2-3.

---

[187] Stephenson, pp. 23-27.

[188] Pearsall, Little Smoky Ridge, p. 56.

[189] Gazaway, The Longest Mile, pp. 108-109.

[190] Schwartzweller, Adaptation of Appalachian Migrants to the Industrial Work Situation, p. 7.

[191] Ibid.

The negative response of some Appalachian migrants to the industrial work situation can also be seen in their high rate of absenteeism. A manager of one of the Illinois State Employment Service offices in Chicago states:

> The Appalachian simply is not familiar with the urban way of life. To him time is not important. In his home town everybody took time to sit or visit with his neighbor. It is not unusual for an Appalachian to work for a few days just to pay the rent and eat and then not show up for a few days after payday. He will return to his job when his money is gone and expect it to still be there.[192]

The personnel director of a northern industry in commenting on problems his company has encountered with Appalachian workers notes that they are generally less competitive than other workers, less interested in advancement, and less aggressive. While sympathetic to the fact that many of the migrants are handicapped in the urban world, he also pointed out that his company has had several Appalachian workers who suddenly left their jobs in frustration and disappointment without giving themselves time to adjust, or they missed work frequently due to imaginary illnesses.[193]

Life in the city may also disrupt relationships within the migrant family. Marital relationships, for example, are often damaged by situations encountered in the city. The traditional relationship between husband and wife can easily be disturbed by the more active role assumed by many women after they become urban residents. Men are accustomed to making virtually all major decisions and to assuming the responsibility for interacting with strangers. However, in the city, some Appalachian women begin to do the shopping, go to PTA meetings, deal with door-to-door salesmen, and talk with social workers and representatives of other community organizations. This disruption of the traditional balance of power offends many Appalachian males.[194]

---

[192] Montgomery, Mountain Life and Work XLIV (September, 1968), 16-17.

[193] John R. Hundley, "The Mountain Man in Northern Industry," Mountain Life and Work XXXI (Spring, 1955), 36-37.

Marital problems also ensue from the fact that it is often easier for the Appalachian wife to secure a job than it is for her husband. This is an extremely upsetting experience for the male who has always seen himself as the breadwinner.[195] Even if the wife should not be able to find a job and welfare dependency is the result, the husband becomes very dejected and the potential for marital problems increases.[196]

---

[194] William E. Powles, "The Southern Appalachian Migrant: Country Boy Turned Blue-Collarite," Blue Collar World: Studies of the American Worker, ed. Arthur Shostok and William Gomberg (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 274.

[195] Daley, The Commonweal XCII (March 13, 1970), 5.

[196] Huelsman, Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science LXXVIII (1968), 102.

The heavy reliance upon male companionship in Appalachia may also hinder the adjustment of the male migrant and contribute to the breakdown of relations with his spouse. Unless he is able to find a new reference group in the city, he is apt to find companionship in the bars of "little Appalachia." This often leads to problem drinking, alcoholism, the loss of a job, and ultimately a broken home.[197]

The children of Appalachian migrants also have problems adjusting to the city. For example, urban schools have found it very difficult to relate in a meaningful way to the migrant child for a variety of reasons. The educational problems of many of the Appalachian children really began before they ever entered the urban school. They have been raised in a subculture that is anti-intellectual and largely devoid of educational goals. If they attended school in Appalachia they are probably behind their urban peers in most learning categories when they arrive in the city. In addition to pre-existing problems, their educational development in the urban school system is further hampered by the high mobility rate of many migrant families and the fact that basic problems of physical survival often overshadow educational considerations. Despite the fact that many Appalachian migrants want their children to receive a good education, they are often poorly educated themselves and can be of little value in terms of overseeing the progress of their children.[198]

---

[197] Daley, The Commonweal XCII (March 13, 1970), 5.

Brought up in a rural area, migrant children are often overawed by the sheer size of the urban school as well as the impersonal relations which characterize them. Thus, their natural shyness and reticence among strangers is compounded. They are not competitive nor aggressive, and these factors, combined with their individualism, leads to withdrawal, passivity, and apathy when they encounter problems within the school. Their cultural background has not prepared them to interact successfully with teachers or classmates, and if the pressure of school life becomes too great they tend to respond by leaving school.[199]

The academic problems of the Appalachian child in the urban school are no doubt related to the fact that many of them are simply unhappy in the city. The superintendent of the Chicago school district which includes Uptown contends that most of the children, as well as the parents, from Appalachia are unhappy away from their native region. Interviews with migrant children in Cleveland support such a conclusion.[200]

---

[198] Henderson, Journal of Secondary Education XLI (March, 1966), 113.

[199] See the following for descriptions of the difficulties experienced by Appalachian children in urban schools: "The Appalachian Child in Chicago Schools," Appalachian Advance III (October, 1968), 6-10; Henderson, Journal of Secondary Education XLI (March, 1966), 113-14; James M. O'Hara, "Disadvantaged Newcomers to the City," NEA Journal LII (April, 1963), 25-27; Powles, p. 277; Branscome, Appalachia IV (February, 1971), 6; James A. Maxwell, "Down from the Hills and into the Slums," The Reporter XV (December 13, 1956), 28; Casey Banas, "Uptown: Mecca for Migrants," Southern Education Report IV (March, 1969), 10-13.

Appalachian children also have frequent encounters with the law in urban centers. Despite the fact that juvenile delinquency has not been prevalent in Appalachia in the past,[201] the "little Appalachia" of such cities as Dayton and Cincinnati have very high delinquency rates.[202] According to Huelsman this can be partially traced to the child rearing practices characteristic of rural Appalachia. As has been noted, mountain children are largely unsupervised and allowed to roam the hills and valleys at will. However, opportunities for getting into trouble are rather limited in rural areas. In those cases where children do violate the law, the parents and other adults concerned with the matter attempt to work out the problem in a face to face manner rather than go to the police. But when Appalachian parents continue to allow their children almost unrestricted freedom after moving to the city problems of delinquency often result. If the migrant child does violate the law parents find that the machinery of justice in the city is an impersonal bureaucracy which does not respond to the person-to-person ways of handling problems in rural Appalachia.[203]

---

[200] Branscome, Appalachia IV (February, 1971), 6.

[201] Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 71-72.

[202] Huelsman, Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science LXXVIII (1968), 101 and Ben R. Huelsman, "Southern Mountaineers in the City Juvenile Courts," Federal Probation (December, 1969), 50.

Given the difficulties of adaptation and assimilation experienced by many Appalachian migrants, it is not surprising that their former homes continue to hold a strong attraction for them. And, of course, there are several aspects of the Appalachian cultural tradition, such as familism, which also keep alive the desire to return "home," if not for good, at least as often as possible:

> . . . "home" and "folks" have a particularly deep significance. . . . Unknowing outsiders type it as the forbidding world of a primitive suspicious people. . . . But home to the Appalachian migrant is the effectively real world, the world of solid contact with the earth, with nature and fresh unpolluted air, the world of family ties and friends and familiar language, where time clocks and traffic lights do not artificially hem one in.
>
> To this blessed land he returns whenever he can, on weekends and vacations and at times of crisis, to visit his father and brothers and his wife's sisters and their husbands and children. He knows it is a poor, ungiving land, and while he hopes he can retire here in his old age he knows that he cannot. . . .
>
> He keeps his soul alive for many years, perhaps, all his life, by his contacts with the homeland.[204]

---

[203] Huelsman, Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science LXXVIII (1968), 101.

[204] Powles, p. 275.

So the weekends and holidays find thousands of migrants returning to Appalachia for spiritual and psychological renewal. However, so difficult does life become in the city for some that they move back to the region to stay; others move back and forth between "home" and the city--perhaps two or three times in a single year.[205] A recent survey conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity indicated that of the major migratory groups in the United States "the Appalachians were the most apt to return often or permanently to their original homes."[206]

The close ties maintained with Appalachia obviously serve a positive function in that the homeland does provide a haven to which the migrant can retreat either temporarily or permanently. However, as long as the migrant identifies more with Appalachia and its cultural tradition than with urban society, integration into the larger society will be extremely difficult. Those who visit the region only periodically have at least adjusted to the extent that life in the city now occupies the majority of their time and thought. But those migrants who visit or move back and forth frequently have, in most cases, not been able to function effectively in the city, and the chances are rather good that they will ultimately return to Appalachia permanently. Their strong identification with their former homes simply strengthens the attitude that life in the city is a transient period rather than permanent.

---

[205] Walls, Appalachian Review III (Fall, 1968), 6.

[206] Branscome, Appalachia IV (February, 1971), 4.

The number of Appalachian migrants who return to the region on a permanent basis is no doubt far below the number who would do so if economic conditions permitted. Those who do return do so for a variety of reasons, but the majority of returnees are people who simply were not capable of meeting the demands of life in an urban, interdependent, and competitive society. Sanders' study of return migration to a depressed area in eastern Kentucky revealed that the returnees were generally those migrants with low educational levels and a lack of job skills who had been relegated to unskilled and low paying occupations in the city.[207] Photiadis found the same to be true of many migrants who had returned to West Virginia. However, he also points out that the lack of education and skill are not the only factors which contributed to the failure of the migrants to adjust to life in the city. Cultural and psychological shortcomings also played an important role in their failure.[208] Plunkett supports Photiadis' contention by asserting that those migrants who return to the region are the people who have the least psychic mobility.[209]

---

[207] John Sanders, "The Depressed Area and Labor Mobility: The Eastern Kentucky Case," The Journal of Human Resources IV (Fall, 1969), 437-450.

[208] Photiadis, West Virginians in their Own State and in Cleveland, Ohio, pp. 16-17.

Not only is the failure of some migrants to adapt to a new environment and their eventual return to the region unfortunate for the individual involved and his family, but it often proves to be harmful to the change potential of the community to which they return. Photiadis states that the negative experiences undergone by some returning migrants have convinced them that the way of life in their home community is far superior to that of the city; while still other returnees exhibit symptoms of social disorganization:

> Due to what is called the law of reciprocity, some of the previous migrants become more attached to their community groups, many of which are traditional and adhere to old ways, while others show symptoms of social disorganization and accept neither the norms of the traditional group nor the norms of the mass society. The former contribute to the cohesion of a community social structure which, in many respects, is similar to that of the past. The latter probably contribute more than any other segment of the community's population to the existence of anomie.[210]

Assimilation and the Migrant

Beyond recognizing that some rural Appalachians have succeeded to one degree or another in adjusting to life in the city, while others have failed, questions should also be raised concerning those factors, in addition to the more obvious ones such as educational and skill levels, psychic mobility, and social class, which seem to be related to the success or failure of the migrant to adjust to and ultimately to be assimilated into the larger society.[211]

---

[209] Bowman and Plunkett, p. 103.

[210] John D. Photiadis, Changes in the Rural Southern Appalachian Community (Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1968), p. 8.

Even though concrete knowledge is lacking about the process of adjustment and assimilation and their determinants several observations have been made relevant to the rural Appalachian migrant which tend to shed some light on the subject. For example, Huelsman's study emphasizes the importance of the length of time the migrant has resided in the city and his occupational success as being particularly important in determining the degree of adjustment which takes place in the life style of the Appalachian family.[212]

---

[211] The term adjustment, as used throughout this study, refers to the ability of the rural Appalachian to adapt his behavior in such a way as to be able to function effectively in the main spheres of the social and economic system. Adjustment, however, does not imply that the rural Appalachian is completely satisfied with the changes in his life style, or that the modifications in his behavior make him indistinguishable from other members of the larger society. Assimilation, on the other hand, is a longer, more gradual process than adjustment, and it involves a more complete absorption into the larger society. Assimilation requires a much more radical change in one's conception of himself and his position in the social order than does adjustment, and, unlike adjustment, it necessitates a rather complete rejection of those cultural features which make the rural Appalachian distinguishable from members of the larger society.

[212] Huelsman, Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science, LXVIII (1968), 98.

Brown, Schwartzweller, and others contend that strong ties with kinsfolk back home often interfere with the process of social integration among some migrants, even though such family ties do play a positive role in terms of social and psychological support in time of crises.[213]

However, while the factors cited above provide a considerable amount of insight into the problems of adjustment experienced by the rural Appalachian migrant, they are not entirely sufficient, particularly in reference to the process of assimilation. Although as has been noted, an adequate theory of assimilation has yet to appear, Shannon and Shannon have developed several propositions concerning the assimilation process which seem to be quite applicable to the Appalachian migrant. Having recognized the importance of factors already cited in this study, i.e., education, length of time in the city, psychic mobility, and employment, the Shannons place special emphasis on the role of communication, the organization of society, and the dimensions of association. They see the ability to communicate effectively as the most important precondition for successful assimilation. Without this ability the migrant will be excluded from the most meaningful interaction system of the larger society. They also feel that the way the larger society is organized in terms of the quality and quantity of available employment opportunities, the equality of educational opportunities, the size of the migrant population within the city, the availability of agencies concerned with migrant welfare, the existence of points of contact with the host society, and other such factors probably has as much to do with assimilation as many of the individual characteristics of the migrant. And finally, they contend that the dimensions of association between migrants and members of the host society are extremely important to assimilation.[214] The following statements summarize the Shannons' thought concerning the relationship between assimilation, dimensions of association, and other related factors:

---

[213] James L. Brown, "The Family Behind the Migrant," Mountain Life and Work XLXV (September, 1968), 6; Harry K. Schwartzweller, Family Ties, Migration, and Transitional Adjustment of Young Men from Eastern Kentucky (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station, 1964), pp. 5-39; James S. Brown, Harry K. Schwartzweller, and Joseph Mangalam, "Kentucky Mountain Migration and the Stem-family: An American Variation on a Theme by Le Play," Rural Sociology XXVIII (March, 1963), 68; Schwartzweller, Adaptation of Appalachian Migrants to the Industrial Work Situation, p. 9.

1. Assimilation takes place if migration to the city has been early in a person's life time.
2. Assimilation is more likely to take place if migrant interaction with members of the host society is frequent.
3. Assimilation is more likely to take place if interaction is intense. Migrants engaging in primary group interaction with members of the larger society are more likely to be assimilated than those who have had only contacts of a

---

[214] Shannon and Shannon, pp. 67-70.

secondary group nature.

4. Assimilation is more likely to take place if contact is carried out over a lengthy period of time.

5. Assimilation is greatest when the social distance between the interactors is not so great that the lower-status person cannot conceive of himself in the position of the upper-status person. Similarity of migrants and hosts has been related to successful assimilation, particularly if the migrant perceives himself to be similar to the host.

6. Assimilation is more likely to take place if the role of the interaction initiator is favorably defined by the lower-status person. Assimilation-facilitating behavior on the part of the migrants is more likely to take place if interaction initiators are co-workers rather than policemen.

7. Assimilation is more likely to take place if the consequences of past interaction have been defined as favorable by the migrant. Rewards rather than problems lead to further interaction and assimilation.

8. Assimilation is more likely to take place if the migrant anticipates favorable consequences from interaction.[215]

Given the possible determinants of adjustment and assimilation mentioned in this chapter, one can begin to see why many rural Appalachians have problems in the city. Many are from the lower class, their cultural background and their educational experience in the mountains account for the low level of educational and job skills, they are rarely successful in obtaining good employment, many have little mobility as a result of their retention of strong ties with their families and friends in Appalachia as well as regional values and attitudes, and both the quality and the quantity of their communication with the larger society restricted by their lack of reliance on the written word and their tendency to live in "little Appalachias." The statements by the Shannons concerning the relationship between dimensions of association and assimilation also suggest a number of reasons for the difficulties experienced by many rural Appalachians. The cultural tradition of rural Appalachia, as we have seen, does not prepare a person to interact with members of the larger society (Points 2 and 3), many migrants obviously do not perceive themselves as being similar to members of the host society (Point 5), nor do they see interaction initiators outside their reference group in a favorable light (Point 6) or anticipate favorable consequences from interaction with strangers (Points 7 and 8).

---

[215] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

Thus, one finds that the relationships of the rural Appalachian with the outside world, whether they take place within the mountains or beyond them, are quite often trying experiences. Such experiences, while they are not negative among all rural Appalachians, still serve to indicate how dysfunctional are certain aspects of the Appalachian subculture, and how incompatible such a cultural tradition is to life in the modern world.

A Cultural Tradition in Trouble

An attempt has been made in the foregoing description of the subculture of rural Appalachia to reveal those features of the cultural tradition which are primarily responsible for the difficulties involved in the promotion of change and development within the region. The cluster of cultural features which characterize rural Appalachia ranging from values and attitudes through goals, interests, customs and the nature of interpersonal relationships have prevented many of the people of the region from coping with the increasing number of problems which beset their daily lives. Their traditional way of life simply no longer prepares them to successfully contend with the realities of twentieth century life, either in the mountains or in the larger society.

It should also be pointed out that cultural dysfunction is evident not only in terms of the problems encountered by the Appalachian migrant, but it can also be observed in the rural Appalachian social system itself which now reveals to a greater extent than ever before that it is no longer an integrated society. While social and economic change in rural Appalachia have not occurred with excessive rapidity when compared to the rate of change in the larger society, the region has experienced during recent years what is by its standards an unparalleled acceleration of the change process.[216] This has resulted primarily from technological developments, improved transportation, and migration, all of which have hastened the intrusion of the forces of modernization into the fabric of Appalachian life. The impact of such change on rural Appalachia has contributed heavily to the disintegration of what was previously a relatively stable social equilibrium in terms of relationships with the region and between the region and the larger society.[217]

The homogeneity of the attitudes and values of the early settlers of the region combined with the long period of isolation to produce an integrated social and cultural system based on a rather common value system. The people of the region developed a personality structure which naturally reflected the social and cultural system within which they were reared. Interaction with the larger American society was quite limited, and neither Appalachians nor outsiders were particularly concerned with one another. However, as communication and interaction between the region and the larger society has increased, and as isolation has declined, the integration and equilibrium which once characterized the social, cultural, and personality systems of rural Appalachia have been seriously impaired. Rising expectations deriving from increased familiarity with the values and life style of the larger society have prompted a desire on the part of many rural Appalachians to enjoy the advantages of life in a modern society.[218] However, as Photiadis points out:

---

[216] For a discussion of the impact of the acceleration of change in rural Appalachia see John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller (ed.), Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970).

[217] Photiadis, Changes in the Rural Southern Appalachian Community, pp. 4-5.

> In general, the integration of the various regional communities into the larger society does not occur at a uniform rate. . . . differences in rates of integration are found not only in communities or their parts but also among the basic components of the community: the social system, the cultural system, and the personality system.
>
> Differential rates of change of the basic components are more important not because they lead to further change, but because they lead to further disorganization. . . . More specifically, it appears that cultural integration, at least in certain important dimensions, occurs faster than the integration of the social system and probably much faster than integration of important aspects of the personality system.[219]

In other words, the acceptance of new cultural values such as economic achievement and the desire for a higher standard of living tends to occur more rapidly than the acceptance of change in community or family norms. However, the normative system will eventually change, and it will change more rapidly than the personality structure of the individual rural Appalachian in terms of his willingness to accept new values and new norms as the correct form of behavior.

---

[218] *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

[219] *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

The introduction of an increased amount of change into the region, and the lack of uniformity in the rate of integration into the larger society which results from such change, have contributed to the disorganization of rural Appalachian society in several ways. It is difficult under present economic circumstances for a great many of the region's people to satisfy their rising expectations. Consequently, they often become frustrated and alienated as a result of their inability to achieve culturally defined goals, and personality disorientation may well be the result:

> The impoverished mountaineer finds himself in a situation not unlike that of other minority groups. Despite the fact that he has been provided with gradually increasing opportunities, he is faced with increasing frustrations based on the sense of relative deprivation and the growing demand that he solve his problems. The experience of relative deprivation is forced upon him through increased physical contact with other people and by way of the mass media. These convey to him an image of the "good life," and in contrast with this image his own existence appears more bleak and hopeless than before. His frustrations are also deepened by those who urge him to self-help and increase his expectations for improvement, for they may succeed in increasing his desire for a "better" life. Unless this goal is attained quickly, the problem often becomes even more frustrating simply because the motivation to solve it is intensified.[220]

---

[220] Ball, American Sociological Review XXXIII (December, 1968), 894.

The situation described above has also been aggravated by pressure from both outsiders and members of the upper and middle classes within the region who exhort the rural Appalachian to conform to the expectations of the larger society. While such pressure may have a positive effect on those who have the potential to participate in and benefit from the change process, it has a negative effect on others:

> . . . those who lack the means of attaining the objectives that are suggested by the change agencies and the more incorporated societal segments face further personal disorganization or retreat. The change demanded of these people may have the effect of leading to further retreat, and, thus, reinforcing the preservation of the traditional social and cultural system. These may appear attractive for their offering security apart from the frustrating complex society. On the other hand, they could lead to further personal disorganization and deviance, and, thus, reinforce anomie. Then, too, such demands may lead to the use of acceptable but anxiety-reducing mechanism such as attachment to strong religious sectarian doctrines.[221]

Thus, as the integration and equilibrium of rural Appalachian society disappears, and as the erosion of traditional values, patterns of behavior, and institutions continues, many of those individuals who cannot or will not participate in the process of adaptation now taking place tend to become increasingly alienated. In commenting upon the situation Schwartzweller has noted:

---

[221] Photiadis, Changes in the Rural Southern Appalachian Community, p. 10. Ball also agrees that such pressures may reinforce traditional cultural practices. Ball, American Sociological Review XXXIII (December, 1968), 894.

> . . . disturbance of the social system . . . almost by definition requires a concomitant adjustment in the personalities of those individuals involved. Individuals who cannot adapt, or who find great difficulty in accepting these changes, learning the new way, and adjusting their lives in accord with the new standards of behavior, may themselves become psychologically disturbed and experience problems of frustration, of mental health, or of personality deterioration.[222]

In summary, the intrusion of the modern world into rural Appalachia has resulted in the development of an increasing number of problems largely because of the inability or unwillingness of large numbers of people to successfully adjust to such change. Yet adjust they must, for the change which has occurred to date is only a modest example of the modifications within Appalachian society which will result from the inevitable continuation of the larger society's involvement in the region. Thus, we find problems deriving from the lack of change and development coexisting with problems brought on by the beginnings of change and development. In addition, the perplexity of the situation is increased by the fact that traditional methods of adapting to the problems besetting the region such as conformity to local values and norms, withdrawal into the haven of the kin group, and out-migration are no longer viable solutions for many rural Appalachians as local norms undergo more rapid change, the extended family experiences more stress, and the urban job market demands more skills. Where does one turn when his stability is threatened by the fact that the newly-discovered goals of the larger society are out of reach and the traditional compensations are disappearing or under attack?[223]

---

[222] Schwartzweller, "Social Change and the Individual in Rural Appalachia," pp. 60-61.

That the rural Appalachian cultural tradition is in trouble is all too obvious, for the society it dominates finds it difficult to change despite a growing desire to do so, many of its people do not fare well either within or outside the region largely as a result of culturally imposed limitations, and the intrusion of change has created formidable new problems within the society. Therefore, when one considers both the obstacles to change created by the cultural tradition of rural Appalachia and the problems which ensue within the social and personality systems of the region as change is introduced, the importance of promoting change efforts and preparing the rural Appalachian to participate in the process through a local institution such as the school becomes more apparent. And if this can be done in accordance with the concept of scale the problems of transition now being encountered by the rural Appalachian society should be reduced considerably.

---

[223] Photiadis and Schwartzweller, Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs, p. 2.

CHAPTER V

RELATED ASPECTS OF THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS, SUBCULTURE, AND EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF RURAL APPALACHIA AS REVEALED BY THE CONCEPT OF SCALE

Introduction

Having briefly described the major social and economic problems of rural Appalachia and examined both the traditional subculture and educational system of the region, it is now possible to analyze the relationships between these three factors by utilizing the concept of scale and its correlates. As has been stated, the efforts of rural Appalachia to become a participant in the larger American society can be more clearly understood if they are perceived as an attempt to advance from a small-scale to a large-scale society. While it would be unrealistic to expect the scale of rural Appalachian society ever to approximate that of the larger society in most respects, a significant increase in regional scale is, nevertheless, not only a realistic prospect if properly pursued but a necessary goal if the desired developmental change is to take place in rural

Appalachia.

Since the major social and economic problems of the Appalachian region have been referred to from time to time throughout this study, it does not seem necessary to describe them again at this point. It has also been pointed out that the origin of most of these problems can be traced to factors over which the rural Appalachian has generally had little control such as topography, isolation, and technological unemployment. However, emphasis must again be placed on the fact that the persistence of the region's social and economic difficulties cannot be attributed entirely to the insolvable nature of existing problems. Instead, their continued existence, despite efforts to alleviate the situation, stems to a very large extent from the inability and/or unwillingness of many of the residents of rural Appalachia to contribute to efforts to overcome major problems. It is the contention of the writer that the continued failure of developmental strategies and, thus, the persistence of regional problems results primarily from the fact that many of the people of rural Appalachia are quite small in scale as a result of socialization within the traditional subculture. In addition, the school, wherein an important part of the socialization process takes place, has served as transmitter of the cultural tradition with its small-scale features rather than taking advantage of its potential as a change agent to develop among its students the skills and attitudes which would enable them to contribute in a significant way to the task of regional development.

If, as the writer suggests, the school is to modify its present role and become an important factor in the development of rural Appalachia, it must obviously undergo considerable change in its philosophy, structure, and operations. However, to develop a new program for the schools of the region in a rapid and haphazard manner, or simply on the basis of educational innovation that appears to have stimulated improvement in other situations will, due to the uniqueness and severity of regional problems, probably not result in the type of educational program capable of producing the human resources needed in rural Appalachia. Instead, the nature and direction of educational change should be determined to a very large extent by information derived from a careful analysis of the traditional rural Appalachian subculture, particularly in terms of the limitations it imposes upon the ability of the people of the region to develop the kind of society (large-scale) which is compatible with the demands of life in the twentieth century. An awareness of these limitations combined with the realization that in many instances current practices within the schools serve to intensify rather than reduce such limitations, should provide those interested in educational change within the region with data which is relevant to any program which they might develop. For that reason the remainder of this chapter is devoted to an analysis of the limitations in scale imposed upon the rural Appalachian by the traditional subculture and a description of the role played by the school in reference to those limitations.

Limitations in Scale Imposed by the Traditional Subculture of Rural Appalachia

In the following treatment of the traditional subculture of rural Appalachia and the limitations it places on the people of the region, the concept of scale and its correlates have been utilized as the basis of analysis inasmuch as the author has contended that social and economic development of the area is essentially equivalent to movement from a small-scale to a large-scale society.[1] No attempt has been made to provide extensive explanations of material drawn from data on the subculture due to the fact that such material has been carefully dealt with in the previous chapter. However, in the event that the reader should desire further information concerning a particular cultural trait, citations have been included in the body of the text which refer to the appropriate page or pages of Chapter IV. In the interest of organizational clarity most of this section of the study has been arranged in accordance with the four levels of existence and their corresponding correlates of scale. Again no attempt has been made to explain each of the levels or correlates as necessary information in regard to them is contained in Chapter II.

---

[1] The correlates of scale developed by Simpkins have been utilized as a basis for the analysis contained in this chapter. In a few instances correlates developed by Shevky and Bell have been used. In such cases they have been identified as the work of Shevky and Bell rather than Simpkins.

By doing no more than comparing the social structure of rural Appalachia to the Wilsons' definition of scale, "the number of people in relation and the intensity of those relations,"[2] it becomes very obvious that regional society is small scale. The long period of isolation, the social and economic patterns which developed as a result of isolation, and the small population severely limited the range of interdependent relationships within rural Appalachia. Due to the fact that no widespread dependence on large numbers of other people ever developed, the narrower interdependent relationships became extremely intense. While the breakdown of regional isolation and the advent of a variety of technological developments have naturally influenced rural Appalachia and increased the scale of its people, it continues to lag far behind the rest of American society in terms of advancements in scale. The limited range of interdependent relationships and the high level of intensity among these limited relationships remain a very definite characteristic of contemporary rural Appalachian society, and this becomes increasingly apparent as one analyzes that society in terms of the correlates of scale.

---

[2] Godfrey and Monica Wilson, p. 25.

Physical (Ecological, Technological) Level

The extent of man's ability to control his material environment is an indication of his level of scale in the physical sphere of existence. According to the concept of scale advancement on the physical level is reflected by the following correlates: the development of energy, technology, scientific methodology, and occupational specialization. With the possible exception of energy development, rural Appalachia remains far behind the larger American society in each of these categories. For this reason the region's population as a whole exhibits a lower standard of living than most Americans.

Aside from the fact that the physical environment of rural Appalachia presents a formidable challenge to those who reside there, the inability of the people to develop or make use of modern methods of meeting that challenge further complicates the situation. The cultural tradition of the region is largely responsible for the lack of technological development and the resulting economic malaise, for it has imposed serious limitations on the rural Appalachian.

Regional attitudes and norms, and the behavior which derives from them, are in many cases antithetical to the attitudes and behavior required by a technological society. The fatalism (153-157) which is so prevalent in the rural areas combined with other-worldly religious beliefs (155, 214, 217-218); attitudes toward time and work (159-163); personalism (163-171) and self-serving individualism (150-153); the lack of leadership and community cooperation (190-199); negative attitudes toward outsiders, particularly those offering advice and expertise (220-222); and the lack of goal-seeking behavior (165, 169-171, 186-187) all serve to hinder the development and utilization of technology. In addition, the low educational median, which is partially a result of cultural attitudes, and the fact that many rural Appalachians do not seek specialized training (162-163) have helped prevent the development of the skilled, labor pool necessary to a sound modern economy.

The use of scientific methodology, which is a prerequisite of technological development, is somewhat limited in rural Appalachia. The rejection of the scientific method and the continued utilization of superstition, myth, and magic in dealing with natural phenomena can be attributed primarily to cultural factors (157-159). Widespread illiteracy and the lack of reliance upon a variety of sources for the communication of fact (170, 180-181) have served to prevent the growth of an appreciation for the utility of science as opposed to superstition and myth. Familism and the child-rearing practices of the region (174-175, 186-188) are also responsible for the dearth of scientific knowledge, for it is from these cultural factors that the rejection of outsiders and the heavy dependence upon traditional attitudes and ideas derive. In addition, religious attitudes of the people and the fundamentalist doctrines promulgated by local churches reflect the fatalism of the region and act as barriers to rational problem-solving (214, 217-219).

Occupational specialization is also limited in rural Appalachia, and such variety as does exist in this respect can be attributed largely to the presence of people who have moved into the region after receiving their training elsewhere. This situation reflects not only limitations in the diversity of economic enterprise resulting from a lack of technological development but also the low educational levels, lack of desire for training, and the rejection of expertise all of which stem to some degree from the influence of the cultural tradition. Another factor which, perhaps, hinders the growth of occupational specialization is the practice of ascribing status on the basis of one's family and background rather than achieving it as a result of one's occupation (162). This practice not only serves to lessen the desire of an individual to enter a particular occupation, but it is also partially responsible for the inability of the rural Appalachian to evaluate people on the basis of what they are rather than who they are. Because of this inability it is difficult for the people of the region to place any faith in the advice or skill of a stranger regardless of his training or to interact with him in his role as a teacher, doctor, lawyer or welfare agent (196-197, 205-206, 220-221).

Thus, the capacity of rural Appalachian society to control the material environment and develop an economy capable of providing the population with a satisfactory standard of living is quite limited. If regional demographic data is analyzed in terms of the concept of scale as suggested by Shevky and Bell,[3] the fact that the past decade witnessed a significant increase in the number of dependent persons within the population and a decrease in the number of working-age adults indicates that the existing potential of the region to master the physical environment is becoming even more limited (226). While rural Appalachia is obviously beset with a host of economic problems stemming in part from geographic factors, it must also be recognized that so long as the people of the region are socialized within a cultural tradition which is more compatible with the past than with the present that the technological development which would enable them to overcome such problems will occur only very slowly.

---

[3] Shevky and Bell, p. 15.

Sociological Level

The amount of autonomy enjoyed by people in terms of their social interaction denotes a given society's level of scale in the social sphere of existence. The extent of such autonomy is indicated by the level of economic cooperation, social mobility (the number of people with which an individual can freely interact), impersonality (the ability of an individual to perceive people acting in roles and to interact with them on that basis), and social influence (the number of people known and influenced by an individual).

Insofar as rural Appalachia is concerned, economic cooperation in the form of extensive trading relations or in support of industrial development has traditionally been quite restricted due to isolation and the pattern of settlement (140-141, 146-148). To this day the lack of urbanization, a poor transportation system, and the remnants of a subsistence economy continue to preclude a complex economic system involving cooperative ventures or a widespread dependency on goods and services from beyond the local area. In addition, the general lack of a sense of community (190), individualism, the rejection of formal groups (193-194), the lack of goal-seeking behavior and limited community leadership (192-196) serve to prevent an increase in economic interdependency. The continued reliance of some rural

Appalachians upon the family as the major economic unit (174-175, 180-182) also discourages an increase in the individual's autonomy in the narrower relations.[4]

A considerable number of cultural factors have also contributed to the lack of social mobility in rural Appalachia. The family and reference group continue to meet most of the needs of the individual, and the strong sense of dependency on a very limited number of people that results naturally impedes the development of the ability to interact freely and successfully with people outside one's immediate environment (174-176, 180). The practice of living close to other members of the extended family and choosing a spouse from the immediate vicinity further limits the possibility of widening one's range of interaction and dependency (172, 175). Child-rearing practices also contribute to the individual rural Appalachian's sense of dependency on a small group of intimates (186-188). The individualism, personalism, and wariness of strangers likewise hinder the ability or desire of the people of the region to interact with an increasing number of people. Even when he migrates to the city the rural Appalachian is very often unable to escape his cultural tradition; and, thus, he finds himself living in "little Appalachia" (229-230, 234-235) and returning as often as possible to the hills (249-251). As a result of their lack of social mobility many migrants have little choice except to maintain their ties with the homeland, for without the ability to interact with strangers assimilation into the larger society remains an impossibility.

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Rural Appalachian society definitely lacks impersonality. The close and intense personal relationships of the region lead to a way of life wherein practically every incidence of social interaction takes place among acquaintances who are dependent upon each other in some way. Such a life style naturally results in a person-oriented approach to nearly every problem. Therefore, the rural resident is almost totally unaccustomed to dealing with people in an impersonal manner and cannot interact successfully with those who assume a particular role such as a policeman, teacher, doctor, or bureaucrat. Because of this he finds it difficult to take advantage of the services offered by any agency, and the limited amount of professional expertise in the region is neither respected nor fully utilized (196-197, 220-221). The reluctance and inability to interact with others in an impersonal manner is, of course, particularly noticeable in the city where many migrants from the region are exploited or find themselves with numerous problems. However, many of them will not or cannot utilize available agencies established to help them avoid or overcome the very difficulties they are encountering (236-239).

In addition to other problems resulting from the inability of the people to interact in an impersonal manner, rural Appalachia's lack of leadership also reflects the ill effects of excessive personalism. Not only is it unusual for the rural resident to join a formal group, but it is even more unusual for him to accept a position of authority should he overcome his doubts and become a member of some community organization. In order to be an effective leader a person must possess, among other things, the ability to perceive himself in a position of leadership. Leadership effectiveness also depends heavily on the ability or willingness of the fellow members of the group to perceive a particular individual in the role of leader. Because the rural Appalachian finds it difficult to interact with others in a situation that requires the adoption of roles rather than a person-to-person encounter, he is neither an effective leader nor a cooperative member of the group.[5] He is simply unable to play the role of a leader or to perceive a neighbor or friend in that capacity (194-195).

Given the information cited above it is rather obvious that the social influence of the rural Appalachian is rather limited. The effects of familism and individualism, as well as the lack of interaction within formal groups and the avoidance of those outside the family or reference group have severely restricted the number of people known and influenced by most individuals in the rural parts of the region.

---

[5] For a more lengthy discussion of this aspect of the rural Appalachian personality see Weller, Yesterday's People, pp. 83-84.

Thus, in terms of autonomy within the social sphere of existence, the rural Appalachian has very little, for his dependence in the wider relations is so weak that he is almost totally dependent on family and close neighbors. Consequently, he has developed no skill in interpersonal relations techniques outside his reference group and cannot, therefore, become involved in a significant way in community or regional development. At best he will simply acquiesce in the decisions of those who will bring about change in the region.

Cultural Level

The concept of scale holds that the cultural level of a society is largely determined by the amount of variety in the ideas exhibited by the populace. The correlates of scale on this level include the communication of fact, identifying with others in time and space, and intellectual and artistic variety. As on the other levels of scale one finds that cultural development in rural Appalachia is rather restricted when compared to the larger American society.

The combination of widespread educational deficiencies and illiteracy with the intense reliance upon the limited number of ideas and values of the reference group serves to hinder the communication of factual data. So too does the rejection of science in favor of myth and superstition. Under these circumstances it is naturally difficult for new ideas to penetrate the reference group, especially to the point of being judged acceptable as bases for behavior. Until a majority of the reference group accepts a new idea there is little hope that the individual member will do so, for he is too dependent upon the goodwill of the group to defy its norms (169-170). As a result of such intellectual conformity and the avoidance of controversy within the family or reference group intellectual and artistic variety are rarely present in rural Appalachia to any significant degree (184-185).

Not only does the rural Appalachian reject identification with a wide range of people in the contemporary world, but his life style shows little evidence that he identifies with the ideas and values of people from the past. Despite his traditionalism he is primarily oriented toward the present and does not reflect the intellectual heritage of Western civilization (159). As a result his ideas and values are confined to those of his immediate circle of intimates. Consequently, advancement on the cultural level of scale does not take place.

Psychological Level

The rural Appalachian has likewise experienced a lack of growth in the psychological sphere of existence as a result of the limitations imposed upon him by his sub-culture. Autonomy of self, resulting from the possession of technological skills, interpersonal competence, symbolizing ability, and self awareness, is not evident among many of the rural residents of the region. Technological skills which would enable the rural Appalachian to secure employment and an adequate income and, thus, provide him with a certain amount of psychological pride and security are limited to only a few individuals. This is true for several reasons including the shortage of training centers in the region and the lack of opportunity for the utilization of such skills. However, the situation can also be attributed to the limited educational attainments of the people which makes training in sophisticated fields nearly impossible, the non-scientific attitudes of much of the population, and the lack of motivation to seek training.

Competence in interpersonal relations outside of the reference group is, as has been noted, almost totally lacking among rural Appalachians as a result of socialization in a closed society. The inability to interact in a comfortable and successful manner with strangers playing a particular role creates a tremendous psychological barrier which further limits the individual's relationships with the outside world.

Low educational levels, illiteracy, the lack of respect accorded the educated or ideas from outside the reference group, and the tendency to view much of what goes on within the school as totally impractical prevents the development of adequate symbolizing ability among many rural Appalachians. The inability to read, write, or express oneself verbally in an effective manner has a profound psychological effect, particularly in the way one views himself. While such limitations may not prove to be of any significance so long as the individual remains among members of the reference group, they become the source of constant failure leading to self-recrimination should the individual venture into the larger society.

The development of self awareness among many rural Appalachians suffers in a number of respects as a result of total dependence upon the family and reference group in the psychological sphere of existence. The identity formation, self-concept, and emotional security of the individual derive from the interpersonal relationships which take place within this very small group of people (167-168). As a result of such limited exposure to a variety of personal relationships, self-concepts are often distorted and unrealistic and emotional security can be found only within the confines of the family and reference group. The psychological and emotional dependency on a narrow range of people generated by this approach to socialization have made it very difficult for the individual to enjoy autonomy of self.

The advent of change in rural Appalachia is placing serious strains on the traditional family structure of the region and those who rely upon the family so heavily for psychological and emotional security are experiencing considerable mental stress themselves (188-189). Even if many rural Appalachian families have not yet been influenced by the changes which are beginning to take place in the region, emotional and psychological problems continue to develop as a result of other aspects of family life. Many families are held together by a sense of obligation and mutual dependency rather than affection. As a result, individual members are forced to interact in a cordial manner with relatives they may dislike intensely. Arguments and disagreements must be suppressed, and the individual finds it necessary to stifle his emotions (183-186).

Thus, on the psychological level of existence, as well as the physical, social, and cultural levels, rural Appalachian society and many of its individual members reflect a number of culturally imposed limitations which indicate that they are small in scale. Therefore, those people are at present incapable of developing the kind of life style which is compatible with existence in the larger American society.

Disequilibrium of Scale in Rural Appalachian Society

Not only is rural Appalachia a decidedly small-scale society, but there are a number of discrepancies in its scale on the various levels. This disequilibrium or unevenness in scale has led to serious social dysfunction.

The introduction of change into the region on the technological level, i.e., transportation, communication, and the mechanization of agriculture and mining, has resulted in an increase in regional scale on this particular level of existence. However, corresponding changes on the other levels of scale have not been forthcoming primarily because of the cultural limitations cited earlier in this chapter. Consequently, the integration and equilibrium or evenness of scale which once characterized the physical, social, cultural, and personality systems of the region have been seriously impaired and social and personal disorganization have resulted (257-262).[6] The disequilibrium in regional scale can also be seen in the inability of rural Appalachian institutions to deal effectively with problems which are resulting from advancements on the technological level. In addition, the difficulties experienced by those who migrate to the city indicate that disequilibrium in the scale of many of these individuals serves to prevent successful assimilation into the larger society.

---

[6] The work of Photiadis describing the erosion of integration and equilibrium in rural Appalachian society tends to substantiate the contention that the region is experiencing disequilibrium in scale. See Photiadis, Changes in the Rural Southern Appalachian Community.

The Relationship of the Rural Appalachian School to the Traditional Subculture

In Chapter III the author attempted not only to describe the major weaknesses of the rural Appalachian educational system, but also to point out that the failure of the system was very closely related to the region's cultural tradition. In general, the statistical evidence cited in Chapter III concerning educational levels, illiteracy, test results, drop-out rates, financial support of the schools, and facilities serve as an example of the circular nature of Appalachian problems--historically the people have not supported the schools financially or otherwise, and the schools have not served the people adequately, thus creating a residue of goodwill or causing the public to perceive the school as a necessary and vital contributor to regional and individual development. Consequently, the people continue to give little support to the school. In addition, there are many people in rural Appalachia who, despite evidence to the contrary, feel that the schools are doing an effective job of educating the region's children and, therefore, they see no need for changes in the curriculum or for additional funds for educational institutions.[7] Despite the fact that a majority of Appalachian parents now want their children to receive an education, many of them have no knowledge of what constitutes an adequate education,[8] and as Hansen has noted, the actions of many rural Appalachians belie their professed beliefs concerning the value of education.[9] Some people in the region continue to openly oppose educational development primarily on religious grounds (218), and Weller argues that despite the desire to see their children derive the benefits which an education may lead to, many parents fear the effect schooling may have on the closely knit mountain family and reference group.[10] Thus, as one observes the malaise of the educational situation in rural Appalachia it is rather apparent that the cultural tradition has not predisposed the people of the region to provide a great deal of support for the schools.

However, it is in another respect that the relationships between the school and the rural Appalachian subculture are more apparent and also more important insofar as the capacity of the school to increase scale is concerned. Reference is here made to the fact that the school has not only failed to contribute much in the way of solving the problems of Appalachia, but that it has also become an integral part of these problems by helping to perpetuate many of those cultural traits which are largely responsible for the social and economic malaise of the region. This results from the fact that the school is a closed system which transmits in an uncritical manner the negative as well as the positive features of the cultural tradition of Appalachia. Staffed largely by natives of the local community or the region who are generally small in scale themselves,[11] the typical school tends to adhere closely to traditional values and beliefs while seldom attempting to expose students to alternative patterns of thought and existence. Curriculums tend to be irrelevant and inflexible despite their obvious shortcomings.[12] Educational consultants are rarely utilized in reference to program development thus reflecting not only a shortage of money but also the typical rural Appalachian rejection of expertise and outside advice. Instructional procedure has generally been left to the discretion of the teachers who are quite often not as well trained as their counterparts across the nation.[13] Given the situation as described above, it seems safe to assume that the educational experiences of the rural Appalachian child leave a great deal to be desired. While it is no doubt true that some children in all parts of the nation receive substandard instruction, the impact of a negative encounter with the school is probably not so detrimental in those situations where the cultural experiences of the child serve to offset to some extent the influence of poor programs and teachers. However, when a rural Appalachian child is subjected to the same type of educational experience it generally serves to compliment the negative aspects of the student's non-school environment and, therefore, becomes a matter of increased importance in terms of its detrimental effects. Living in what is virtually a closed society and attending a school which mirrors that society the rural child has little chance of gaining any knowledge or understanding of alternatives to the traditional life style of his region. The intellectual inbreeding characteristic of mountain society is simply too much in evidence in the schools to allow for a significant expansion of scale on any of the levels of existence.

---

[7] Chapter III, pp. 99-100.

[8] Ibid., pp. 96-97.

[9] Ibid., p. 98.

[10] Ibid., p. 97.

---

[11] Ibid., pp. 112-119.

[12] Ibid., pp. 107-110.

[13] Ibid., pp. 119-120.

Even though the school does not deviate to any great extent from the time-honored values and beliefs of the traditional subculture, it, nevertheless, represents a somewhat alien structure in rural Appalachia in the sense that the cultural tradition of the region has never really assigned much importance to formal education; and it has generated a host of traits which are in direct conflict with the philosophical premises and the operating procedures of the school as an institution. The conflicts stemming from this situation are quite apparent, and unfortunately while the school has accommodated itself in many ways to the prevailing subculture, it has neither found the means to change its procedures in such a way as to avoid conflicts nor to modify the cultural traits which are largely responsible for the conflicts. Consequently the conflicts continue. For example, educational objectives and procedures in rural Appalachian schools are in many ways much more representative of the ideas of outsiders than of the people of the region. This can be seen in the emphasis on college preparatory curriculums. Aside from attempts to inculcate and strengthen commitment to local values and norms, the school is not teaching what many rural parents want taught and consequently there has long been a traditional resistance to "book learning." Because of the lack of symbolizing ability and the difficulty many rural Appalachians have in dealing in abstractions and because of the rural emphasis on practicality and the application of one's knowledge, most school subjects are deemed useless and even somewhat dangerous to a child's mental development. This attitude is, of course, passed on to the children and because of their loyalty to the views of the family, the school finds it very difficult to overcome the resistance shown to the study of subjects which are considered impractical and thus of little value within the mountain culture.

The school also finds that rural Appalachian parents often interact with their children in such a way as to completely offset any success which teachers might have had in creating an interest in learning. Weller cites the following example:

> In these adult-centered mountain families, separation between adults and children begins about the time the child enters school and increases rapidly. Because the realm of ideas is not his world, the parent lacks interest in the school. Probably there are no books at all in the home, the child has never been read to, and when he begins having trouble with homework he finds little help or encouragement from parents who may actually have had less education than he has. In some cases adults may revel in the fact that through "just common sense" they can solve arithmetic problems, for example, faster than their children, who use school taught methods.[14]

The adult-centered family also forces children, because of the lack of attention they receive after infancy to become members of an adolescent reference group (179-180, 186-187). Like adult Appalachians the youth of the region become extremely devoted to such groups and dare not defy their norms lest they be expelled. Having grown up in homes in which planning for the future and object goals were considered of little importance, it is not surprising that members of these adolescent reference groups tend to ridicule any of their associates who attempt to do well in school.

---

[14] Weller, Yesterday's People, p. 109.

The personalism of rural Appalachian society with its emphasis on sensitivity to people rather than ideas naturally creates problems for the school. So too does the widespread rejection of postponed gratification and the prevalence of the traditional attitudes toward work. The lack of impersonality in the rural Appalachian culture prevents many students as well as their parents from being able to deal comfortably with a bureaucracy, even one so small as the school; it is also responsible for the inability of either parent or student to interact satisfactorily with teachers and administrators. The fatalism and the reliance on myth and superstition conflict with the efforts of teachers to introduce scientific concepts, and many subjects such as history and literature have little meaning for a society which does not identify with people from the past.

Socialization within a reference group wherein the individual rarely makes decisions by and for himself results in many students becoming passive receptors rather than active participants in the classroom. Not only does the culture instill a sense of passivity and a lack of motivation in children, but the school with its continued use of traditional methods of instruction with a minimum of student inquiry and participation simply allows rural Appalachian children to remain apathetic and dependent upon the decision-making of others. Nor do classrooms with a minimum of interaction between teacher and students and among the students themselves contribute in any way to an increase in the interpersonal competence so badly needed by the mountain child.

Given the points of conflict between the cultural tradition of rural Appalachia and the concept of education emphasized in the schools of the region, it is obvious that the school faces a difficult task. Unfortunately the reaction of many regional schools to the situation represents both a compromise and an avoidance of responsibility. By making little or no effort to motivate or even allow students to critically examine their traditional values and ideas the schools have in a sense reached a compromise with the conservative communities which they serve. In addition, the school has further avoided its responsibility to the region and its people by simply superimposing upon them a curriculum and instructional procedures modeled after those used elsewhere rather than developing an educational program which is relevant to the needs and aspirations of a region seeking entrance into the larger society.

By continuing to reflect the static equilibrium of the region rather than adapting in a positive way to the demands made upon it by a unique situation, the rural Appalachian school has failed to utilize its potential as an agent of change. The current activities of the school, considered in terms of scale, are obviously incapable of increasing the ability of the children of rural Appalachia to either participate in regional development or to migrate and become assimilated into the larger society. Th schools are not providing students with the occupational skills necessary to secure an adequate standard of living in a technological society, they have done very little to increase the student's autonomy on the sociological level, students are not being introduced to a wide variety of ideas, values, and alternative life styles, and neither have they served to help the student come to grips with important questions relating to self awareness.

Summary

By applying the concept of scale and its correlates to cultural and educational data concerning rural Appalachia an attempt has been made to reveal important relationships between the social and economic problems of the region, the limitations which the culture has imposed on the people in terms of their capacity to deal with these problems, and the role of the school in the perpetuation of regional underdevelopment. It is hoped that the foregoing analysis has provided some insight into the role played by certain cultural factors in the social, economic, and educational dilemmas facing rural Appalachia and that concerned educators will take these significant factors into consideration when attempting to design an educational program capable of developing the human resources necessary to advancement towards a large-scale society.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS PERTAINING TO THE PROPER DIRECTION OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE IN RURAL APPALACHIA

Introduction

Throughout the study the writer has maintained that the educational system of rural Appalachia possesses the potential to make an important contribution to the promotion of social and economic development within the region and thus serve as the major bridge to the larger American society. Emphasis has also been placed upon the fact that the realization of this potential depends very largely upon the extent to which certain major modifications are made in existing educational philosophies, objectives and procedures. Assuming that there are educational decision-makers and other leaders within rural Appalachia who likewise perceive the school as a potential change agent and who are willing to act upon the basis of that perception, an attempt has been made to provide for them an analysis of those factors which the author believes must be given the utmost consideration in determining the nature and direction of educational change if the school is ever to assume an important role in the stimulation of regional development. Therefore, at this point in the study, having provided an analysis of the contemporary situation in rural Appalachia primarily in terms of the significant relationships between the social and economic problems of the region, its cultural tradition, and the quality of the existing educational system; and having contended that the solution to the problems of Appalachia necessarily involves enlarging the scale of the populace by means of a relevant educational system, it now seems incumbent upon the writer to supplement the analysis of the problem and the recommended solution by commenting upon the practical application of the theoretical considerations which have been dwelt upon at some length. Accordingly, the remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a description of the broad outlines of the type of educational program which the concept of scale and the cultural and educational data surveyed by the writer indicate should be effective in developing the human resources needed by rural Appalachia.

An Educational Program Based on the Concept of Scale

Before proceeding with a description of the recommended educational program, it is necessary to interject several important points. First, it is not the writer's intention to set forth a complete and thoroughly detailed program for the schools of the region. Instead, the following recommendations are meant to serve primarily as a broad outline or a set of guidelines for those seeking a relevant alternative to the present approach to education in rural Appalachia. The suggested program is offered in a rather incomplete form intentionally; for it is the writer's belief that the successful implementation of such far-reaching changes will require a considerable amount of experimentation with regard to teaching methods, materials, and the organization of faculties and students on the part of those school systems which might be involved. Such an approach, taking place within the guidelines suggested by cultural and educational data and the concept of scale, probably holds more promise of fostering the development of a program which is not only capable of enlarging the scale of students but is also acceptable to administrators and teachers than would an attempt to justify the adoption of a detailed program which is relatively inflexible, untested, and perhaps not at all suited to the needs of every rural school in the region.

Secondly, given the fact that the following recommendations are primarily concerned with enlarging the scale of rural students on all four levels of existence, it seems best in terms of organization and clarity to give separate consideration to the suggested response of the school on each of the levels. Despite the separate treatment accorded each level it is necessary to keep in mind that educational modifications relating to each of the four levels must be implemented simultaneously in order to prevent disequilibrium of scale.

It should also be noted at this point that even though the writer has not referred to a particular age at which children should be included in the recommended educational program, the assumption is being made that students should be exposed to this type of educational experience as soon as they enter school. With the possible exception of those activities designed to increase scale on the physical or technological level, the participation of elementary students does not seem to present any major problems. It should even be possible for the school to contribute to the elementary student's development on the technological level by introducing him to a wide variety of vocational choices and to some of the skills and attitudes which will obviously be required of any person who wishes to enter most vocations in the larger society.

Physical (Technological, Ecological) Level

The economic problems which plague rural Appalachia offer rather convincing evidence of the fact that many of the region's people are extremely small in scale on the physical level. They are quite limited in their ability to control the material environment and thus have virtually no physical autonomy. The economic situation, while it has improved for some of the populace as the region slowly develops an industrial base, has worsened during the last two decades for those rural Appalachians whose low-skilled occupational roles in mining and agriculture have virtually disappeared. It is apparent to most educators in the region that the schools must develop new programs which can in some way help the depressed condition of the rural Appalachian economy. However, as has been mentioned, those familiar with both the problems of the region and the field of manpower training have warned that the school cannot succeed in meeting the challenge by simply offering a vocational education program, as so many people have suggested.[1] This warning is given additional support by the concept of scale which contends that the provision of vocational training without corresponding attention being given to social, cultural, and psychological limitations will not guarantee successful entry into the larger society.

Given the nature of the economic malaise that is present in so much of rural Appalachia, it is apparent that some type of vocational training for students is necessary if their limitations on the technological level of existence are to be overcome. However, it is equally obvious that such training must be simply one part of a larger program which is concerned with the social, cultural, and psychological development of students as well. In addition, the focus of vocational education in rural Appalachia in terms of the type of jobs students are being trained to fill must be modified.

---

[1] See Chapter III, pp. 127-128.

It is the feeling of the writer that every child in the region's rural schools should be given the opportunity to participate in a vocational training program which includes not only the development of particular skills on the part of the student but which also provides careful orientation to the variety of employment opportunities that are available and will probably continue to be available in the foreseeable future. Whatever the nature and scope of the vocational program may be it should definitely be conducted by the rural school system, for if it is to be successful it must be correlated with the other activities of the school which are designed to increase scale on the social, cultural, and psychological levels.

While it is not within the competence of the writer to delineate the vocational curriculum which should be offered in rural Appalachian schools, it is necessary to elaborate upon several additional points which should be given careful consideration when developing such a curriculum. One such point is related to the questionable relevancy of the type of training now being provided in many vocational programs. Far too many extant vocational curriculums concentrate much of their training efforts on job categories which will provide only limited employment opportunities or which are even now becoming obsolete. Vocational programs would be more consistent with the needs of rural Appalachians for self-respecting and upwardly-mobile employment if they trained people in the area of human services such as practical nursing, nurses' aides, teachers' aides, and x-ray technicians.

Although elementary students could be introduced to certain aspects of the vocational curriculum, the junior and senior high schools would, of course, be responsible for the majority of training. When students have reached the age where they are capable of taking care of themselves, it would be extremely helpful in terms of increasing scale if summer jobs in their field of training and interest could be arranged for them in urban areas. A work-study program of this type would serve several functions. For example, it would assure the student that economic stability can be achieved and that there is an alternative to menial labor or welfare; it would allow him to experience life in a large-scale society, hence his autonomy and independence would be gradually increased; his range of social interaction would widen; his technical competence would be increased; his self-concept should improve; and his motivation for additional training would probably increase.

If at all possible the schools should also make vocational training available to adults within the community during the evening and on Saturdays. While this is now being done on a small scale in some parts of the region, such programs need to be increased and more widely publicized. If the efforts of the school should succeed in helping adults to learn a skill and procure satisfactory employment, the school, as well as the individuals who receive the training, would profit enormously. Local students would be provided with positive models to emulate, adult residents of the community would be involved in the operations of an institution which is often viewed with suspicion and hostility, and public support for the school and its program would be broadened.

In summary, a program of vocational training which is perceived as an integral part of the school's efforts to enlarge the scale of its students is badly needed throughout rural Appalachia. Without such a program there is little hope that the people of the region will soon achieve the degree of physical autonomy which will enable them to contribute in a significant way to the development of a viable economy.

Sociological Level

As has been frequently noted the rural Appalachian is severely limited in his capacity as well as his opportunities to interact on a free and equal basis with members of the larger society. This general absence of personal autonomy within the social sphere of existence is clearly revealed in the lack of social mobility, impersonality, and social influence among many residents of the region. The inability to function effectively with respect to interpersonal relationships outside the reference group has resulted in the tendency to rely heavily on the decision-making of others, particularly when dealing with strangers. Aside from the traits described above, many rural Appalachians also exhibit additional limitations which are related to interpersonal communication and cooperation, thus making it very difficult to promote the type of community programs so badly needed in the region.

With respect to the sociological level of existence, the school should direct its efforts toward the enhancement of the ability of the rural Appalachian to deal with other individuals in decision-making processes and in cooperative ventures which necessarily involve frequent conflict and compromise. The ultimate objective of such a program is the development of social skills which are transferable to a wide range of human activities both within and beyond the local community. The school must recognize and act upon the necessity of developing those social skills and processes which are not a part of the rural student's cultural background. Whatever type of program is initiated by the school in response to this particular need must concentrate on the continuous widening of the extremely limited range of interpersonal interaction within the region. The existing pattern of intense interaction only within the reference group must somehow be modified so that communication and cooperation among the several reference groups within the community is stimulated. The range of interaction should then be broadened even further so as to include frequent contacts with people in nearby communities. Eventually, of course, efforts must be made to provide opportunities for students to interact with as many people as possible from outside the region. This could be accomplished to a certain extent through the previously mentioned work-study program, student exchange programs of some sort, frequent field trips, the utilization of more teachers and administrators from the larger society, and the frequent use by the school of persons within the community or nearby communities who are representatives of the larger society.

However, to ensure that constant attention is given to the sociological limitations of many rural Appalachian students it would be wise for the school to create a specific program for this purpose. Such a program, for example, might be organized around a particular type of student group which will hereafter be referred to as a core group. The core group would be a task-oriented democratic group established for the purpose of confronting problems and cooperatively fulfilling objectives defined by the participants. More specifically, it is an artificially-created democratic community within the school which includes the same dynamics operative in a community or in the larger society. In such a group it is necessary for the participants to confront and resolve conflicts in public, assume and recognize leadership roles, to both exercise and delegate authority, and to interact with people from outside one's reference group.

The several core groups within a given school could operate during extended home room periods or in a specific time period set aside for this purpose at least twice a week. They would center their attention on problems which are of interest to students such as hall passes, dress codes, field trips, the curriculum, textbooks, and materials. It is important to note that while the problems chosen for discussion must be meaningful to students, the nature of such problems is relatively unimportant insofar as the theory underlying the core group is concerned. The dynamics of the process itself represent the important factor.

Eventually the smaller core groups within the school should be given the opportunity to meet together for the purpose of dealing with problems or projects which concern the student body as a whole. In addition, core groups from neighboring schools should be encouraged to meet together, discuss mutual concerns, and, perhaps, promote joint efforts relating to community or area wide tasks. In this way students will be gradually broadening the range of their social interaction patterns; they will be given the opportunity to participate in a decision-making process, often among strangers, in which they are called upon to contribute; and they should begin to recognize the necessity for role-playing behavior, cooperation, and compromise if group endeavors are to succeed.

Several additional points which are pertinent to the operation of core groups should also be made so as to make it quite clear that the objectives of such an endeavor will never be realized if such groups are subjected to the type of administrative manipulation that has befallen most student governments. Given the objectives of the core group in terms of enhancing interpersonal techniques, stimulating the desire of the students to make and act upon their own decisions, and to demonstrate the values of cooperation and compromise, it would certainly be counterproductive if the school established such groups without intending to allow them to operate in the proper manner. For this reason it is extremely important that those faculty members who are chosen to work with core groups clearly understand their role. They must be persons who are capable of allowing the group process to develop along its own lines without overt or covert attempts at manipulation. In essence the core group adviser is to function as a catalyst for group action rather than an initiator of action and as a provider of expertise on alternatives only when called upon. For this reason the adviser must be non-directive in his manner and at the same time be capable of developing a social and intellectual environment in which members of the group can disagree strongly with one another without resorting to the rural Appalachian's tendency to view such disagreement as a personal affront.

The core group in operation will no doubt be loud, confusing, and rather ineffective at least during the initial period of existence. A great deal of patience, understanding, and encouragement will be necessary on the part of administrators and faculty. The success of the program will also require that student decisions be allowed to stand and that the groups be allowed to operate and make decisions without fear of reprisal. This is obviously asking a great deal of educators, but the sociological limitations of many rural Appalachian children are so great and existing programs have accomplished so little in terms of providing students with the social autonomy demanded of people in the larger society that only a bold and innovative approach of some type appears to have much chance of success in changing the situation.

If the establishment of core groups within the school should prove to be successful in realizing their objectives, regional scale might be further enlarged by engaging local adults in a similar program. The school, working closely with community development personnel, could organize adult core groups which would concentrate their attention on problems within the community. The inclusion of the local school in community development efforts might serve to offset to some extent the fear and distrust of community development workers who are quite often not fully accepted by rural Appalachians.

Psychological Level

In addition to the vocational training aimed at increasing the rural Appalachian's control over the physical environment and the creation of core groups which are intended to stimulate the development of skill in interpersonal relations, the schools must also concern themselves with the psychological limitations imposed upon their students by the cultural tradition of the region. The vocational curriculum and the core groups can be expected to make a valuable contribution in this respect, for the possession of skills enabling one to secure employment and the development of competence in interpersonal relations are necessary prerequisites of autonomy of self or advancement on the psychological level of existence. However, important as these factors may be it is necessary for the schools to add a third dimension to their programs which is directly concerned with psychological development. Before proceeding with a description of the writer's recommendations with respect to the psychological dimension of the program, it would, perhaps, be well to first consider the type of problems with which the school must contend.

The most obvious as well as the most debilitating psychological limitations exhibited by the rural Appalachian derive from certain aspects of the manner in which he develops his sense of self awareness. Since the identity formation, self-concept, and emotional security of an individual are essentially products of his interpersonal relationships, the range of those relationships naturally becomes an important factor in determining the psychological make-up of the individual. When the range of interpersonal relationships is extremely limited, as it is in the case of so many rural Appalachians, an adequate and realistic self-concept may not develop in the case of many individuals and emotional security may exist for them only within a very small number of personal acquaintances. Under these circumstances one tends to become so dependent psychologically upon a small group of people that autonomy of self simply does not develop. Handicapped by this limitation, it is difficult for such individuals to deal effectively either with their own social and economic difficulties or those of the community and region in which they live. It is to these factors relating to the development of self awareness and autonomy of self that the school must address itself if scale is to be enlarged on the psychological level.

An increase in the number of school counselors would probably represent a step in the right direction, if counselors were fully aware of and concerned about the psychological limitations of the rural Appalachian. However, it appears to the writer that a broader program specifically designed to help large numbers of students develop self-confidence, examine and clarify their values, establish some life goals, and arrive at a realistic but positive self-concept is needed. For that reason, it is felt that the implementation of a program conceived by the late Kimball Wiles, or a similar one based on the same rationale, would be desirable.[2]

In accordance with Wiles' conception, each child in the school would spend at least six hours a week in what he termed an analysis group. This group, consisting of not more than eleven students and a teacher-counselor, would have no pre-determined curriculum or program of studies to follow; instead the participants would explore questions, ideas, value, positions, and problems which are relevant to them, particularly problems related to situational adjustment and the absence of goal-seeking behavior. One of the major purposes of the analysis group is to help each student analyze his thoughts and actions and those of his peers by providing him with the opportunity and the encouragement to critically examine his cultural heritage, particularly the traditional norms and values of the region, and to become acquainted with the ideas and values of other cultural groups. If at all possible the group should remain a unit throughout their years in school, and hopefully they will develop a sense of community. If this should happen it is possible that they will establish a set of peer group norms which will not only militate against the widespread tendency to drop out of school but also serve as an alternative to the normative system of the kin-based reference group.

---

[2] Kimball Wiles, "The High School of the Future," The High School of the Future: A Memorial to Kimball Wiles, ed. William M. Alexander (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 5-6.

Like the core group adviser, the teacher-counselor of the analysis group must be carefully selected since he or she will play a key role in helping students learn to deal with their limitations on the psychological level. The teacher-counselor in this instance represents a very important socializing agent not so much because of what he teaches but because of the positive relationships he must build with students and the empathetic and non-threatening environment he must create if he is to succeed in meeting the objectives of the analysis group. An individual given the responsibility of working with an analysis group must perceive his role as that of helping the rural Appalachian student to feel more secure, to confront rather than avoid problems, to develop some life goals, to clarify rather than merely accept a set of values, to become aware of his own potential, and above all to emerge from the experience with a positive self-concept.

By creating analysis groups, or a program with a similar philosophy and objectives, the school will be focusing on elements which either permit the individual to utilize his potential in an expanded situational field or which can easily deter him from doing so. To refuse to give attention to the psychological aspect of the rural student's total development will no doubt serve to limit the effectiveness of any efforts the school might make with respect to the physical, sociological, or cultural levels of existence.

Cultural Level

Insofar as an enlargement of scale on the cultural level is concerned, the schools of rural Appalachia are faced with the problem of developing a program which is aimed at increasing the variety of ideas to which their students are exposed. Both intellectual and artistic variety are quite limited in the region as are the communication of factual data and the extent of identification with other people in time and space. Consequently, the thinking and, therefore, the behavior of many rural Appalachians are representative of members of closed societies everywhere in that they have not been influenced in many respects by a significant proportion of the intellectual heritage of the human race. As a result it is not particularly surprising that social and economic development in the region proceed at an extremely slow rate.

Given the fact that schools in general, including those in rural Appalachia, have accepted, at least in theory, the task of transmitting the cultural heritage of the Western world to their students, it should not prove to be an exceedingly difficult task for the schools of the region to modify their present programs in such a way as to place more emphasis on those aspects of that heritage which appear to be most important in terms of increasing scale on the cultural level. However, in order to accomplish this, certain changes with respect to staff selection, educational objectives, and teaching methodology must be made.

Since the success of most, if not all, educational endeavors is determined to a large extent by the competence of the teachers involved, it is necessary to give some attention to the type of teacher needed to staff the schools which might someday adopt a program similar to the one being described. It is, of course, difficult to determine in any exact manner what combination of personal and intellectual qualities is necessary to ensure a competent and successful teacher under the best of educational circumstances, but the difficulty of the task is increased considerably when one attempts to describe the type of teacher needed by rural Appalachian schools which are dedicated to enlarging the scale of their students. However, ignoring for the moment the intellectual qualifications needed by teachers in the region, emphasis will first be placed on other qualities which appear to the writer to be absolutely essential to the success of a program which is intended to increase scale. This is not meant to impugn the importance of academic competence, for it is naturally assumed that intellectual ability is always an important ingredient of a successful teacher's make-up. Instead, it is meant to emphasize the necessity of other qualities which simply cannot be ignored if the school is committed to goals which go beyond the imparting of particular information.

A very important consideration in the area of personnel selection involves the level of scale represented by both teachers and administrators. It is rather obvious that if student scale is to be enlarged in any significant way large scale teachers and administrators are necessary. Therefore, the extremely heavy reliance upon personnel who are natives of the local community or a similar community must cease. The recruitment of large-scale educators from urban centers either within or, preferably, beyond the region must become a widespread practice in rural

Appalachian school systems. Given the present oversupply of teachers throughout the nation, such recruitment no longer represents an impossible task. The need for such personnel is so vital to the success of any program designed to enlarge scale that the writer would go so far as to suggest that state education officials in the Appalachian region assume the responsibility for the hiring and placement of school personnel if local boards of education refuse to end the intellectual inbreeding which characterizes so many faculties in rural schools.

In addition to considerations related to recruitment, it is also necessary to give some attention to the fact that teachers who are expected to enlarge the scale of their students must have a good understanding of the concept of scale, the traditional rural Appalachian subculture, and the implications which both hold for teaching. Therefore, the teacher training institutions throughout the region should include the study of these factors in their programs. Teachers drawn from institutions outside the region could be familiarized with the concept of scale and the necessary cultural data through reading materials and in-service programs within the school systems in which they work.

Perhaps, the most important quality needed by teachers who might participate in the program that is being suggested involves the ability and the willingness to interact with students in a particular manner. Emphasis has repeatedly been placed upon the fact that many rural Appalachian students have a tendency to be rather apathetic and to passively accept decisions made by others. Reference has also been made to the narrow range of sources of ideas and values upon which so many students are intensely dependent. In view of the fact that any program based on the concept of scale must be concerned among other things with increasing the student's confidence, autonomy, self-reliance, and his sources of ideas and values, it is necessary to first overcome their apathy, passivity, and distrust of alien ideas. If this is to be accomplished the schools must forego their rather rigid and formal traditional approach and develop a social, emotional, and intellectual climate which is conducive to the enlargement of scale. The classroom teacher is primarily responsible for the development of such an environment and can create it only by interacting with students in an open, honest, and concerned manner. The situation demands a somewhat permissive and non-directive teacher who constantly encourages the free exchange of ideas and opinions and who represents a respected source of information who can gradually introduce students to a broader range of values and ideas than has been available to them in the past. The student must know that the teacher respects him and his ideas, that what he has to say does matter, and that he can and must make the vital decisions of his life rather than leave the task to someone else. Constant encouragement must be given students through positive verbal and non-verbal behavior on the part of the teacher. Dependence, apathy, and mistrust are not overcome by inattention, coercion, or manipulation but rather by an atmosphere of respect, concern, and honesty.

In view of the extremely important role of the teacher in a program designed to increase scale, whether it be a classroom teacher or an advisor to a core or analysis group, it is obvious that faculty members must be carefully chosen with particular criteria in mind. For that reason an attempt has been made to delineate several considerations which should be taken into account when developing such criteria.

Having commented upon the type of personnel necessary to the success of attempts by the school to enlarge scale on any of the levels of existence, it is now possible to conclude the description of the broad outlines of the recommended program for rural Appalachian schools by focusing on the type of modifications which need to be made in order to deal with limitations on the cultural level. Here again no attempt has been made to develop a complete curriculum; the intent is simply to identify particular areas of the existing curriculum where modification is essential in terms of objectives and teaching methods.

Reference was made in Chapter III to the fact that existing curriculums in rural Appalachian schools were often quite irrelevant because so much emphasis was placed on college preparatory work. While the writer agrees that a certain amount of justifiable criticism can be directed at the schools for not providing a broader curriculum, it is a mistake to assume that college preparatory courses hold no value for rural children. It is the purpose for which they are taught and the manner in which they are taught rather than the subject matter of the courses which are not relevant to the needs of the children of the region. Unfortunately there are those who insist that the children of the poor and the culturally different need only a "job-oriented" education devoid of exposure to the humanities, arts, and the social and natural sciences. An educational experience based on exposure to the broad spectrum of human knowledge is needed by all, for the limitations imposed upon the rural Appalachian or the cultural level of existence, though less obvious than the limitations he exhibits on the technological and sociological levels, are indeed central to the perpetuation of the anachronistic life style of a small-scale society. The existing liberal arts curriculum designed for college preparatory students can be used to enlarge the scale of rural Appalachian students if it is utilized in a different manner and if its objectives are modified. This requires above all else that the disciplines represented in the curriculum be viewed in terms of their instrumental value with respect to an increase in scale rather than as ends in themselves and that the materials and the methods utilized by teachers reflect this philosophy. Therefore, it is important that the inquiry or reflective method of teaching and materials consistent with this approach be used in the classroom. The use of this method will also do much to compliment the activities of both the core groups and the analysis groups whose success largely depends upon the development of the willingness and the ability of the student to engage in a reflective approach to his own problems and those of his peers.

An example of what might be done with one aspect of the present curriculum in the interest of enlarging scale on the cultural level can be provided by considering a possible modification of the language arts program.[3] As has been noted the communication of fact in rural Appalachia is severely limited by the rather widespread lack of reliance on written material. While rural residents are not all illiterate, verbal tradition remains the main channel of communication, and books and other reading materials are not highly valued. Consequently, it is very difficult to expose people to new ideas and values. In an attempt to offset this situation, the school should place more emphasis than ever in the language arts program on the development of reading skills. Every effort must be made to motivate students to read by exposing them to written materials which stimulate their interest and which demonstrate that information of value to them can be derived from reading. By doing so, the schools could do much to gradually increase the level of factual communication and thus the scale of the region. However, such an approach necessitates a rejection of the idea that students must read a host of particular literary selections simply because such selections are considered classics or because they are good representatives of particular literary forms. Instead students must be provided with the opportunity to select materials which are of some interest and value to them.

---

[3] The author is indebted to Michael Kearney and O. Norman Simpkins for several of the suggestions which are made with reference to the enlargement of scale on the cultural level.

The social studies provide further examples of the utilization of existing courses for the purpose of enlarging scale. Since the whole thrust of the social sciences, and to some extent the field of history, leads in the direction of the recognition of universal characteristics of human behavior, exposure to these disciplines could do much to increase the extent to which rural Appalachians are able to identify with others in time and space. Thus, the students should be more positive in their attitudes toward ideas and values which differ from their own. Hopefully, the result would be a gradual change in the insular values of the region and a breakdown of the traditional rejection of strangers and expertise from the outside world which does so much to retard social change in the region. Again, only if the social studies are taught in such a way as to allow students to inquire for themselves into the human past and the complexities of human behavior will any significant success be forthcoming. The mere transmission of factual data by means of a textbook or lecture will probably not motivate the interest of the rural Appalachian student to the point where they will benefit to any great extent from exposure to history or the social sciences.

Properly taught, the natural sciences could do much to reduce the dependence of students upon superstition, myth, and magic as the means of explaining natural phenomena. The objective of teachers employing relevant concepts from the natural sciences would not be to manipulate people into accepting a host of new ideas or a particular view of reality but to create a climate of relativity and discovery and to provide students with additional sources of ideas and beliefs.

An expansion of the level of both the intellectual and emotional variety in rural Appalachia could be approached by the proper utilization of courses in the area of the humanities such as literature, drama, art, and music. However, the objectives of such courses should be to provide exposure not to develop scholars, to encourage participation rather than the memorization of factual data, and to provide additional sources of ideas and values rather than to inculcate a particular set of values.

The recommendations made to this point are, of course, not exhaustive. However, they should provide a sufficient number of examples of the type of approach, particularly in terms of objectives and methods, which is demanded by any attempt to increase scale on the cultural level. It might also be pointed out that even though this particular aspect of the recommended program is meant to stimulate the development of cognitive autonomy, it would also serve, if successful, as an important means of increasing scale on the other three levels of existence, particularly the sociological and psychological levels. This is true not only because an increase in knowledge serves to provide the rural Appalachian with an improved means of ordering reality but also because it should remove some of the sense of inadequacy from which he suffers when interacting with members of the larger society.

It would also be advantageous to the cultural development of a given community if the school would offer adult education courses dealing with any subject in which local citizens have expressed some interest. The adult education program must be based strictly on the interest and needs of the community rather than academic considerations, for the objective in this instance is not the development of scholarship but to increase community scale. While one cannot realistically expect such a program to result in extremely significant increases in scale, it would probably do a great deal to satisfy a secondary objective--that of gaining the support of adult participants for both the program of the school and the efforts of their own children to develop a life style which is compatible with existence in the larger society.

Summary

Hopefully, this study will in some way contribute to the thinking of those educators in rural Appalachia who are primarily responsible for the direction of educational change in the region. While the writer fully recognizes that the recommended educational program outlined in this chapter would be difficult as well as expensive to implement and that it no doubt contains serious flaws, it is being offered, nevertheless, as an example of the type of change that will be necessary if the rural Appalachian educational system is to make a major contribution to the region's attempt to join the larger society. Much more important to the success of the schools in developing a relevant educational system than the suggestions contained in this chapter is the analysis of the significant relationships which exist between the problems of the region and the limitations which are imposed upon the populace by the cultural tradition of rural Appalachia. Whether educators accept or reject the recommendations made in the final part of the study it is hoped that they will give extremely thoughtful consideration to the relationships between the region's cultural tradition and its social and economic problems as they plan the future of rural Appalachian education. To fail to do so will be to ignore the very factors which are most important with respect to the problem of enlarging scale, and it is this problem which must be overcome before rural Appalachians will be able to contribute to regional development or to migrate and become fully assimilated members of the larger society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Batocci, P. A. "The Psychological Self, the Ego, and Personality," in *The Self in Growth, Teaching, and Learning*, ed. D. E. Hamachek. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Brewer, Earl D. C. "Religion and the Churches," in *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*, ed. Thomas R. Ford. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962.

Brown, James S. "Population and Migration Changes in Appalachia," in *Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs*, ed. John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

Brown, James S. and George A. Hillery, Jr. "The Great Migration, 1940-60," in *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*, ed. Thomas R. Ford. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962.

Brown, James and Harry K. Schwartzweller. "The Appalachian Family," in *Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs*, ed. John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

Campbell, John C. *The Southern Highlander and His Homeland*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1921.

Carse, William. "Teacher Education in Culture Change," in *Culture Change, Mental Health and Poverty*, ed. Joseph C. Finney. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1969.

Caudill, Harry M. *Night Comes to the Cumberlands: A Biography of a Depressed Area*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1962.

Cooley, Charles H. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1902.

Dobriner, William M. Social Structures and Systems: A Sociological Overview. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1969.

Durkheim, Emile. The Division of Labor in Society. Trans. George Simpson. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1947.

Fermen, Louis A. "Manpower Adaptation: Problematic Social Conditions," in Manpower Development in Appalachia: An Approach to Unemployment, ed. Frederick A. Zeller and Robert W. Miller. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968.

Ford, Thomas R. "Comments," in Poverty: New Interdisciplinary Perspectives, ed. Thomas Weaver and Alvin Magid. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1969.

Ford, Thomas R. "The Passing of Provincialism," in The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962.

Gazaway, Rena. The Longest Mile. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969.

Gans, Herbert J. The Urban Villagers. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Gerrard, Nathan L. "Churches of the Stationary Poor in Southern Appalachia," in Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs, ed. John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

Giffin, Roscoe. "Appalachian Newcomers in Cincinnati," in The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962.

Gouldner, Alvin and Helen. Modern Sociology: An Introduction to the Study of Human Interaction. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

Graff, Orin B. "The Needs of Education," in The Southern Appalachian Region, ed. Thomas R. Ford. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962.

Greer, Scott. The Emerging City: Myth and Reality. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America: Poverty in the United States. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1963.

Hobhouse, L. T. Social Development: Its Nature and Conditions. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1924.

Hansen, Niles M. Rural Poverty and the Urban Crisis: A Strategy for Regional Development. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1970.

Haynes, W. Warren and Mary J. Bowman, Resources and People in People in East Kentucky. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1963.

Johnson, Cyrus M., A. Lee Coleman, and William B. Clifford. Mountain Families in Poverty, Final Report. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.

Karlin, Jules. Man's Behavior. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1967.

Kephart, Horace. Our Southern Highlanders. New York: Outing Publishing Co., 1913.

Kluckhohn, Clyde and Henry A. Murray. "The Shaping of the Individual," in An Introduction to Social Science, ed. Arthur Naftalin et al. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1953.

Lantz, Herman R. "Resignation, Industrialization, and the Problem of Social Change: A Case History of a Coal Mining Community," in Blue Collar World: Studies of the American Worker, ed. Arthur Shostak and William Gomberg. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Looff, David H. "The Psychiatric Perspective on Poverty," in Poverty: New Interdisciplinary Perspectives, ed. Thomas Weaver and Alvin Magid. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1969.

Mangum, Garth. "Manpower Implications of the Appalachian Regional Programs," in Manpower Development in Appalachia: An Approach to Unemployment, ed. Frederick A. Zeller and Robert W. Miller. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968.

Matthews, Elmora M. Neighbor and Kin: Life in a Tennessee Ridge Community. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press, 1965.

Mead, G. H. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Page, W. J. and Earl C. Huyck. "Appalachia: Realities of Deprivation," in Poverty as a Public Issue, ed. Ben B. Seligman. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Pearsall, Marion. Little Smoky Ridge: The Natural History of a Southern Appalachian Neighborhood. Birmingham, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1959.

Photiadis, John D. "The Economy and Attitudes Toward Government in Appalachia," in Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs, ed. John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

Photiadis, John D. and Harry K. Schwartzweller (ed.). Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

Powles, William E. "The Southern Appalachian Migrant: Country Boy Turned Blue-Collarite," Blue Collar World: Studies of the American Worker, ed. Arthur Shostak and William Gomberg. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Schwartzweller, Harry K. "Social Change and the Individual in Rural Appalachia," in Change in Rural Appalachia: Implications for Action Programs, ed. John D. Photiadis and Harry K. Schwartzweller. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

Shannon, Lyle W. and Magdaline. "The Assimilation of Migration to Cities," in Social Science and the City: A Survey of Urban Research, ed. Leo F. Schnore. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968.

Shevky, Eshref and Wendell Bell. Social Area Analysis. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1955.

Simpkins, O. Norman, Michael Kearney, and Jerry Moles. Action for Appalachian Youth. Charleston, West Virginia: Charleston Youth Community, Inc., 1963.

Sorokin, Pitiram A. Social and Cultural Dynamics. 4 vols. New York: American Book Co., 1941.

Stephenson, John B. Shiloh: A Mountain Community. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1968.

Vance, Rupert. "The Region's Future: A National Challenge," in The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey, ed. Thomas R. Ford. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1962.

Wiles, Kimball. "The High School of the Future," in The High School of the Future: A Memorial to Kimball Wiles, ed. William M. Alexander. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1968.

Wilson, Godfrey and Monica. The Analysis of Social Change. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1945.

Weller, Jack E. Yesterday's People: Life in Contemporary Appalachia. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1965.

Zeller, Frederick A. and Robert W. Miller (ed.). Manpower Development in Appalachia: An Approach to Unemployment. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968.

B. PERIODICALS

Anderson, Margaret. "Education in Appalachia: Past Failures and Future Prospects," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVI (November, 1964), 443-46.

"The Appalachian Child in Chicago Schools," Appalachian Advance, III (October, 1968), 6-10.

Ball, Richard A. "A Poverty Case: The Analgesic Subculture of the Southern Appalachians," American Sociological Review, XXXIII (December, 1968), 885-95.

Banas, Casey. "Uptown: Mecca for Migrants," Southern Education Report, IV (March, 1969), 10-13.

Boiarsky, Carolyn. "Updating Education in Appalachia," Audiovisual Instruction, XIII (December, 1968), 1096-98.

Branscome, James. "Appalachian Migrants and the Need for a National Policy," Appalachia, IV (February, 1971), 3-8.

Brown, James S. "The Conjugal Family and the Extended Family Group," American Sociological Review, XVII (June, 1952), 297-306.

Brown, James S. "The Family Behind the Migrant," Mountain Life and Work, XLIV (September, 1968), 4-7.

Brown, James S., Harry Schwartzweller, and Joseph Mangalam. "Kentucky Mountain Migration and the Stem-family: An American Variation on a Theme by Le Play," Rural Sociology, XXVIII (March, 1963), 48-69.

Carmichael, Benjamin E. "Impacts on Education in Regional Areas," Educational Leadership, XXVI (October, 1968), 17-20.

Casey, Barbara. "Early Childhood Education: A Priority Need," Appalachia, II (November, 1968), 18-22.

"Characteristics of Tennessee School Children," Appalachia, III (August, 1970), 16.

Coles, Robert. "Mountain Thinking: Its Our Nothing," Appalachian Review, I (Summer, 1966), 12-17.

Coles, Robert and Joseph Brenner, "American Youth in a Social Struggle (II): The Appalachian Volunteers," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXVIII (January, 1968), 3-46.

Crowell, Suzanne. "They Stayed," American Education, V (August/September), 23-25.

Daley, Mary D. "The Not So Beverly Hillbillies," The Commonweal, XCII (March 13, 1970), 4-5.

De Jong, Gordon F. and Thomas R. Ford. "Religious Fundamentalism and Denominational Preference in the Southern Appalachian Region," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, V (October, 1965), 24-33.

"Educational Problems," Appalachia, I (April, 1968), 21-24.

Ford, Thomas R. "Status, Residence, and Fundamentalist Religious Beliefs in the Southern Appalachians," Social Forces, XXXIX (October, 1960), 41-49.

Gerrard, Nathan L. "The Serpent-Handling Religions of West Virginia," Trans-Action, V (May, 1968), 22-28.

Henderson, George. "Poor Southern Whites: A Neglected Urban Problem," Journal of Secondary Education, XLI (March, 1966), 111-14.

Hooper, Frank H. and Suzanne Skinto, "Surveying the Appalachian Child," Appalachian Advance, III (March, 1969), 27-29.

Huelsman, Ben R. "Southern Mountaineers in City Juvenile Courts," Federal Probation, XXXIII (December, 1969), 49-54.

Huelsman, Ben R. "Urban Anthropology and the Southern Mountaineer," Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science, LXXVIII (1968), 97-103.

Hundley, John R. "The Mountain Man in Northern Industry," Mountain Life and Work, XXXI (Spring, 1955), 33-38.

Jaros, Dean, Herbert Hirsch, and Frederic J. Fleron, Jr. "The Malevolent Leader: Political Socialization in an American Sub-Culture," The American Political Science Review, LXII (June, 1968), 564-75.

Kaplan, Berton H. "The Structure of Adaptive Sentiments in a Lower Class Religious Group in Appalachia," Journal of Social Issues, XXI (January, 1965), 126-41.

Levine, Abraham S. "'Yesterday's People' and Tomorrow's Programs," Welfare in Review, VII (July/August, 1969), 8-12.

"A Look At Vocational Education in Appalachia," Appalachia, III (August, 1970), 1-8.

Maxwell, James A. "Down from the Hills and into the Slums," The Reporter, XV (December 13, 1956), 27-29.

"Migrants Still Have Mountain Barriers," Appalachian Advance, III (October, 1968), 10-13.

Montell, Lynwood. "Death Beliefs from the Kentucky Foothills," Kentucky Folklore Record, XII (July/September, 1966), 81-86.

Montgomery, Bill. "The Uptown Story," Mountain Life and Work, XLIV (September, 1968), 8-18.

Nelsen, Hart M. "The Internalization of Education as a Value in Rural Appalachian Culture: Myth or Reality?" Business and Economic Problems in Appalachia I (August, 1968), 7-15.

O'Hara, James M. "Disadvantaged Newcomers to the City," NEA Journal, LII (April, 1963), 25-27.

Pearsall, Marion. "Communicating with the Educationally Deprived," Mountain Life and Work, XLII (Spring, 1966), 8-11.

Peterson, Bill. "Discrimination in the Hill Country," Southern Education Report, IV (March, 1969), 3-9.

Peterson, Bill. "Letcher County Is Trying," Southern Education Report, IV (October, 1968), 25-27.

Sanders, John. "The Depressed Area and Labor Mobility: The Eastern Kentucky Case," The Journal of Human Resources, IV (Fall, 1969), 437-50.

Schrag, Peter. "The School and Politics," Appalachian Review, I (Fall, 1966), 6-10.

Schrag, Peter. "The Schools of Appalachia," Saturday Review, XLVIII (May 15, 1965), 16-17.

Schwartzweller, Harry K. and James S. Brown. "Social Class Origins, Rural-Urban Migration, and Economic Life Chances: A Case Study," Rural Sociology, XXXII (March, 1967), 5-19.

Skinner, Vincent P. "Mountaineers Aren't Really Illiterate," Southern Education Report, III (July/August, 1967), 18-19.

"Statistical Report," Appalachia, IV (September, 1970), 33.

Strauss, Robert. "Poverty as an Obstacle to Health Progress in our Rural Areas," American Journal of Public Health, LV (November, 1965), 1772-779.

Tapp, Jesse W., Rena Gazaway, and Kurt Deuschle. "Community Health in a Mountain Neighborhood," *Archives of Environmental Health*, VIII (April, 1964), 510-17.

Walls, Dwayne E. "Appalachian Migrants: How you gonna keep 'em down on the farm?", *Appalachian Review*, II (Fall, 1968), 3-8.

Widner, Ralph R. "The Four Appalachias," *Appalachian Review*, II (Winter, 1968), 13-19.

Wirth, Louis. "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology*, XLIV (July, 1938), 1-24.

Wright, Mary W. "Public Assistance in the Appalachian South," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, XXVI (November, 1964), 406-409.

Zeller, Frederick A. and Wil J. Smith. "Manpower Problems in Appalachia," *The Journal of Industrial Arts Education*, XXIX (March/April, 1970), 29-35.

C. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Appalachian Regional Commission. *The Appalachian Regional Commission Education Advisory Committee Interim Report*. Washington: Appalachian Regional Commission, 1968.

Appalachian Regional Commission. *The Appalachian Regional Commission Research Report No. 12: Teachers in Appalachia*. Washington: Appalachian Regional Commission, 1970.

Bowman, Mary J. and H. Dudley Plunkett. *Communication and Mountain Development: A Summary Report of Two East Kentucky Reports*. Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, 1969.

Cain, Stephen R. *Community Action in Appalachia*, Unit III: *A Selective Description of a Knox County Mountain Neighborhood*. Washington: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1968.

Gladden, James W. *Community Action in Appalachia*, Unit IV: *Family Life Styles, Social Participation, and Socio-Cultural Change*. Washington: Office of Economic Opportunity, 1968.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Educational Statistics. *Fall 1969 Statistics of Public Schools, Advance Report*. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1970.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service. *Mental Health in Appalachia: Problems and Prospects in the Highlands*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

U.S. President's Appalachian Regional Commission. *Appalachia*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

D. UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

Brown, James S. *The Family Group in a Kentucky Mountain Farming Community*. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station, 1952.

Cleland, C. L. *Church and Family in Modern Rural Appalachia*. Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1967.

Donohew, Lewis and Joanne M. Parker. *Impacts of Educational Change Efforts in Appalachia*. Las Cruces, New Mexico: Educational Resources Information Center, Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, New Mexico State University, 1970.

Graff, Orin B. *Appalachia's Educational Situation: Twelve Basic Propositions*. Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1967.

Ogletree, James R. *Appalachian Schools--A Case of Consistency*. Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1968.

Pavlick, Anthony L. *Toward Solving the Low-Income Problem of Small Farmers in the Appalachian Area*. Morgantown, West Virginia: Agricultural Experiment Station, West Virginia University, 1964.

Photiadis, John D. Changes in the Rural Southern Appalachian Community. Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1968.

Photiadis, John D. West Virginians in their Own State and in Cleveland, Ohio. Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1970.

Schaie, K. Warner. The 1965 Head Start Psychological Screening Program. Morgantown, West Virginia: Human Resources Research Institute, West Virginia University, 1967.

Schwartzweller, Harry K. Family Ties, Migration, and Transitional Adjustment of Young Men from Eastern Kentucky. Lexington, Kentucky: Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Kentucky, 1964.

Schwartzweller, Harry K. Adaptation of Appalachian Migrants to the Industrial Work Situation. Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1969.

Schwartzweller, Harry K. and James S. Brown. The Social Structure of the Contact Situation: Rural Appalachia and Urban America. Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1969.

Weller, Jack E. A Profile of the Appalachian Family. Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1968.

Zeller, Frederick A. and Robert W. Miller. Problems of Community Action in Appalachia. Morgantown, West Virginia: Office of Research and Development, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1968.

E. DISSERTATIONS

Dykes, Archie R. "A Study of Public Finance in the Southern Appalachian Region." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1959.

Kearney, Michael E. "The Developmental History of a Social Action Program, Action for Appalachian Youth, Kanawha County, West Virginia." Unpublished Master's thesis, Marshall University, 1965.

Mullenax, Foster G. "Mass Media Use Patterns and Interests Among West Virginia Rural Non-Farm Families of Low Socio-Economic Status." Unpublished Master's thesis, West Virginia University, 1968.

Taylor, Daniel B. "An Assessment of the Characteristics, Education, and Training of Public School Superintendents in Southern Appalachia and West Virginia." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, West Virginia University, 1965.

F. MISCELLANEOUS SOURCES

Appalachian Profile. Charleston, West Virginia: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1970.

De Jong, Gordon F. "Is Out-Migration from Appalachia Declining?" Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meeting, San Francisco, August 28-31, 1969.

National Education Association, National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities and the Kentucky Education Association. Carter County, Kentucky: A Study of an Unconscionable Combination of Politics and Education. Washington: National Education Association, 1963.

Personal interview with O. Norman Simpkins, Chairman, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia, June 30, 1971 and July 9, 1971.

Simpkins, O. Norman, Michael E. Kearney, and Jerry Moles. "Felt Needs." A working paper developed by the authors at Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia, 1964 (Mimeographed).

Weller, Jack E. "Many Educators Won't Accept Help," Newsfocus: AEL. Undated newsletter published by the Appalachian Educational Laboratory, Charleston, West Virginia, 10-12.